

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

CAN we determine and define the Essence of Christianity? This is a question that has been handled by nearly every notable writer who in the last century has discussed the claims of the Christian religion. It is raised by the suggestion that there are elements in the developed Christian faith which are not necessarily part of it, and by the results of comparative religion which compel us to declare in what respect the Christian faith differs from others. Harnack devoted a book to the question. Loisy followed suit. Troeltsch contributes to the discussion. Quite recently Principal JACKS settled the matter confidently in his book on 'Religious Perplexities.' And now Principal GALLOWAY devotes a long essay to it in his new work *Religion and Modern Thought* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. net).

Dr. GALLOWAY is Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, and a recognized authority in philosophic thought. His book contains a series of discussions of problems raised by modern thinking in reference to religion. The unsettlement of the time is in his mind throughout, and perplexed souls will find in him a very competent guide on many difficult questions. He writes with a sure grasp and out of profound knowledge, and his thinking is so clear and so plainly expressed that his book will be read with unalloyed pleasure. One of the most interesting essays is on 'The Essence of Christianity.'

Harnack thought the question was a purely historical one, and went back to the origins. What was the gospel of Jesus Himself? To find this you must eliminate Paul and the Fourth Gospel. The answer lies in the Synoptic Gospels, and the answer is: the Fatherhood of God, with its associated doctrines of the sonship of man, the infinite value of the soul, and the righteousness of the kingdom. This is the living core of Christianity. The key that unlocks the door is Simplification.

Is this answer sound? Loisy answers No. He points out that Harnack leaves out what to the mind of Jesus was essential—the eschatological element. Harnack's Christ is not the Christ of history, but of Liberal Protestantism. Besides, the problem is not merely a historical one. In history there are no bare 'facts.' It is values that move human wills and are the real forces in historic development. Finally, it is not practicable to answer our question by going back to the origins. Christ's consciousness is not quite the same thing as historic Christianity. You have to seek that in the consciousness of His followers, in what Christ was to them. The faith of Christians is not the faith of Christ, but faith *in* Christ, which was embodied in definite conceptions of His person and worth.

Is Loisy's view any truer? For him the religious

beliefs of Christ are not the essential thing, but the living evolution of the Church's faith and doctrine to meet the changing needs of a changing world. Hence the essential is the expansive spiritual life of the Church ever embodying itself in fresh forms.

This, however, is even more open to criticism than Harnack's answer. For it cuts the tree loose from the root, Christian development from the historic life from which it sprang. Christ becomes little more than a symbol in His religion. It is a precarious principle to lay down that what is really valuable in Christianity is essential, for 'it is notorious that different persons make very different valuations of the same object.'

Can we not find an answer, then, to our question: What is Christianity? Well, we cannot, in so many words. Christianity is a great Gift of God to the world. Every age sees in it something of the truth. Christian history is a progressive vision of the supreme good. 'Each age brings something of its own to the interpretation of the Christian Religion, and expresses its faith in terms of the values which are immanent in its own life.' The essence of Christianity can reveal itself only as it is taken up into and vivified by the life of each successive age.

The real problem is not that of essence, but the question of gaining an insight into the broad principles or factors which distinguish the Christian outlook on the world and life. And these are obvious: first, the place of Christ in Christianity; second, the nature of Christianity as a redemptive religion; and, finally, the existence of a transcendent world wherein man's destiny lies.

The written sermons of Dr. ORCHARD are always welcome. We say 'written' advisedly, for these sermons are packed so full of thought that they must be sometimes difficult for the hearer. Dr.

ORCHARD himself says that he has selected the sermons found in his new volume, 'some because they were liked by those who heard them, and some because they were not.' This new volume is called *No More War* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). The title is taken from the last sermon in the volume.

But let us turn to the second sermon. It is called the 'Consciousness of Christ.' The consciousness of Christ interests Dr. ORCHARD because it is, he says, the ultimate court of appeal concerning Christ's Divinity.

Dr. ORCHARD is well aware that the appeal to Christ's consciousness may lead to an impasse. He does not build his argument for Jesus' Divinity on any passages in the Fourth Gospel, or even in the Synoptics, in which the consciousness of Jesus would appear to be directly revealed. His object is to find some ground which would not be denied even by those critics of the Synoptics whose process of throwing doubt on everything which seems to make too direct a claim of Divinity is carried, according to Dr. ORCHARD, to such an extent that 'no argument is possible because everything is suspected which can be used to support Christ's divinity precisely for that reason.'

What does Dr. ORCHARD make his starting-point, then? He starts from those passages in which the consciousness of Jesus is only indirectly revealed. He even goes further, and builds upon those sayings of Jesus which seem to contradict the received estimates of what His consciousness includes or supports.

Dr. ORCHARD asks in the first place what we can infer about the Divinity of Christ from Jesus' clear consciousness of God. Jesus Christ, he says, speaks with assurance about God, His utterances in this way being markedly different from those of the prophets. 'He does not preface His utterances with, "Thus saith the Lord God": there is no arguing of His authority to speak for God; it is

assumed without claim or argument. And on the other hand we find not the slightest dubiety about the ways of God which even the greatest theologians have always confessed. These utterances do not point to a knowledge of God acquired through experience or by reflexion. Christ's knowledge about God everywhere bears the mark of immediate intuition. His knowledge of God belongs to Him because of what He is.

There is one saying which expressly distinguishes between Jesus' knowledge and the knowledge which the Father has. "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Although this is one of those negative texts to which we are to be allowed to ascribe the greatest value because they appear to contradict the prevailing opinion, yet the very distinction only serves to enforce the point of Christ's unique knowledge. The text puts the Son not only above men, but above the angels, and thus indirectly and by the way claims for Him a unique place.

Dr. ORCHARD turns next for a proof of Jesus' Divinity to indirect revelations of His consciousness of Himself. He deals with Jesus' conception of Himself as the Messiah; but leaving this aside, his two examples are Jesus' unconsciousness of sin and the high-handed manner in which He rescinds the Mosaic law. Dr. ORCHARD says there is 'no word to show that Jesus had the slightest consciousness of sin. This marks Him off in a most significant way not only from the rest of mankind, but from the most saintly among men; for the higher man rises in actual goodness the more he is aware of how much he falls short. And there is no word from the lips of Jesus that ever suggests that He came to this condition of mind through a stage of penitence and subsequent assurance of forgiveness.'

On Jesus' attitude to the Mosaic Law, Dr. ORCHARD says that His direct claims to be greater than Solomon or Jonah are 'themselves indirectly surpassed when, without either defence or apology,

He rescinds the Mosaic Law with the simple but majestic claim, "but I say unto you."'

Dr. ORCHARD's third argument for Jesus' Divinity is got from His own sense of His relationship to mankind. Jesus' demands, he points out, for man's love and attachment go beyond anything which family or country can claim: men must be prepared to forsake all and to risk their lives in following Him. But in Jesus' interview with the rich young ruler Dr. ORCHARD finds something which goes even beyond that. The rich young ruler 'had asked what he should do to inherit eternal life; there is enumerated in reply the second half of the decalogue; to this there is added the surrender of his riches, and this only as the final condition of following Jesus. That is to say, eternal salvation depends ultimately upon relation to Christ. If one asks why there is no enunciation of the first half of the decalogue, the only possible answer is that Christ has put loyalty to Himself in its place. And this indirect claim is supported by the explicit declaration that men's confession now will determine His owning them before His Father.'

Building up his argument further, Dr. ORCHARD quotes Jesus' invitation to men to come to Him, because He can give them rest, as a promise of something which it is agreed none but God can do—which is only emphasized if Jesus is consciously borrowing from the invitation of Wisdom in the Apocrypha.

Professor J. A. FINDLAY of Manchester has followed up his previous studies with a remarkable book on *The Realism of Jesus* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). It professes to be a paraphrase and exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, but it is much more. It is a sincere, suggestive, and original presentation of the mind of Jesus, and of the historical environment that makes it intelligible. The book makes the same impression on the mind as did Glover's 'Jesus of History' and McFadyen's

'Jesus and Life,' an impression of intense reality, as though the writer had got inside the thought and 'worn it next his skin.'

Professor FINDLAY faces the question: How can we observe the injunctions of the Sermon on the Mount? He has been handling the difficult passage about turning the other cheek and going a second mile. So far as the *meaning* of these injunctions goes, the writer thinks it is very much this, that everything in social life depends on restoring the right human relationship, the only terms on which men can live together, and this can best be done in such cases as Jesus mentions by a surrender of personal rights. We can discourage the will to wound the feelings of a brother-man by ignoring an insult: 'for rudeness soon tires if it is not noticed; it lives by seeing itself resented.'

This will sufficiently indicate the line of Professor FINDLAY's exposition. It does not do much to make the injunctions easier. It does not explain them away. It makes them as hard as ever. But then comes the question: Where is the power that can make possible this single-minded and generous attitude Jesus has been describing? The answer of this book is a striking one. It is very much this, that our inability to carry out the teaching of Jesus is due, not to lack of piety, but to the fact that we are not *human* enough; and what brings the human into exercise and thus binds us all together is love for Jesus.

We are not human enough. We surround ourselves with abstractions like nationality, federations, trade unions, and these hide from us our common humanity. Human trustfulness and reasonable good nature would carry the fabric of society along. But we erect these barriers between classes and individuals and forget what is common to us all. What we need is to be simply human and *naturally* human. The idea of a Christian who is openly insulted remembering in the nick of time the verse about non-resistance, and, with an expression of saintly

resignation, turning the other cheek, is not the idea of Jesus.

This sense of our common humanity comes to us when we learn to love Jesus truly. What does 'truly' mean? Well, look at the disciples. Jesus was to them at first a peculiar possession. They saw God in Him, but He was still outside them. They were spectators, and were for ever quarrelling as to which of them could get most out of Him. Then, because they were divided, they failed Him in the hour of His need, and their very failure brought them at last into a fellowship. When their private hopes and prejudices had all been forgotten, He came back to them, but only to tell them that He was theirs for ever on condition that they shared Him with all the nations.

This was the fellowship of His Holy Spirit. The disciples discovered that all kinds of people could share their experience of Jesus, and human nature became a new thing because He revealed Himself in it. That is the bond that unites us to all men, that at any moment we may see Christ in them. To see this is to be human, to live it is to be *naturally* human. And we come to this by the love of Jesus, not as our own possession, but as the possession of all sorts of people. Nothing is too good to hope for in each other, and nothing too hard to do for each other.

And so the Gospel goes further back than 'get right with God,' or even 'get right with your fellow-men.' Its essential message is 'get right with Jesus, and your love for Him will make you brave and simple enough to get right with man.'

Psycho-analysis is for the moment all the rage. Its literature is issuing from the Press in a steady stream. It means something of which account has to be taken. As to how much it means, judgment may well be held in suspense for a time. We can only 'wait and see.'

What interests us here is the statement, repeated by many writers, that psycho-analysis is bound to modify moral and religious doctrine. Is this merely another example of the familiar case of those who are enthusiastic over a new discovery in one department of study imagining that all departments of thought must thereby be profoundly affected? One may complain that so many writers should confidently predict a modification of religious doctrine without indicating fairly definitely what sort of transformation is in their minds. Does it amount to a revolution, or is it merely a change of emphasis? We have a right to be informed.

We apprehend that in all probability what certain writers on psycho-analysis have in their mind when they speak of a modification of religious doctrine is a modification of Christian ethics. We cannot see what else it can be. Admittedly the teaching of the new psychology, that 'repressions' are dangerous to physical or mental health or to both, does seem to bear hardly on what is in many quarters supposed to be the Christian doctrine of renunciation and self-denial. In his recent book, 'A Study in Moral Problems,' Mr. B. M. LAING acknowledges the force of this new argument in favour of self-interest, and to all appearance he finds it unanswerable.

The first remark to be made is this. Psychoanalysts are far from being the first to cast doubt upon the value of renunciation as an ideal. To mention no others, Spencer argued the point very well in his 'Data of Ethics.' We doubt if the new considerations adduced from the analysis of pathological and abnormal cases make the argument very much stronger.

Our second point is this. Renunciation is not at all the Christian ideal, as we find if we go for our conceptions of what Christianity teaches, not to the hermitage, but to the New Testament. What needs to be changed is not the New Testament, but the 'monkish' ethics. The latter is

held unfortunately by many to whom the very word 'monk' is anathema. On the other hand, it is fortunately held in very few monasteries. For the Western Church in particular was, on the whole, wise enough to see that the goal to be aimed at was not 'repression' but 'sublimation' of egoistic desires. And that is precisely what psychoanalysts are now proclaiming as though it were a new discovery.

That self-repression is a true end in itself, that in itself and for its own sake it is either good or likely to lead to good, is nowhere taught by Jesus or Paul. So much is the contrary the case that 'superaltruists' have criticised the Christian Ethic as a thinly disguised egoism. They have found fault with the rule 'thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' They are almost shocked to find the writer of Hebrews saying that Jesus endured the Cross 'for the joy that was set before him' and counselling His followers to be like Him in that. They have some doubt about our Lord's question, 'What shall it profit a man . . . if he lose himself?'

True, there is the saying, 'let him deny himself,' etc., but it must surely be read in the light of other sayings, where the self-denial is conditioned by such words as 'for my sake,' or is inculcated as the necessary step towards a fuller self-realization.

The Christian doctrine of self-denial has no doubt been often expressed in sermons and in hymns in such a way as to make criticism pertinent, just as has been the case with the doctrine of contentment with one's lot. What we complain of, however, is that psychoanalysts and others seem to confuse the real Christian teaching with popular misunderstandings of it.

'You call yourselves sinners. That is blasphemy. You are Gods! . . . When I see a young mother bending over her child I bow before the image of

God our mother. When I see a harlot leaning down from her balcony I bow before her also. I say, "Behold the mother at her sport among the children of men." These words, spoken by a chief prophet of Hinduism at the Chicago Congress of Religions, are quoted by the Rev. E. J. BICKNELL, M.A., in *The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin* (Longmans ; 6s. net).

He does well to quote them, for they show in one fearful flash the hell towards which modern thought is moving when it turns its back on the Christian doctrine of sin. And no doctrine in our time has been more rudely assaulted or more insidiously undermined. Evolution is held to have shown that sin is but the relic of the ape and tiger, from which humanity is steadily purging itself. More recently, the new psychology claims to have disproved the Christian idea of sin. It takes a biological view of all mental life, and traces the building of all human conduct out of a small number of primitive instincts. No room is left for free will, and conscience is only an emotion. Moral distinctions merely exist in the mind of the individual or the community, and God is but a projection of the human mind.

Is it possible to turn the battle in the gate? Mr. BICKNELL's book is at least a very able attempt. He calls science itself to witness that many species have made false steps, and strayed from the upward

path. 'We may apply this to the spiritual evolution of the human race. It is perfectly conceivable that the race as a whole has failed to live up to God's purpose. . . . That this is the truer statement we most firmly believe, and in support of it we appeal to the facts both of the individual life and the world at large.' So much for the doctrine of the Fall.

On the subject of original sin it is argued that some such conception is an intellectual necessity. It stands for the whole movement of the race away from God's purpose. It may be described as 'the devil's counterpart of grace. Grace is God's personal influence. And grace is always mediated directly or indirectly through the divine society, the people of God. . . . All the means of grace are social. Original sin is the antithesis of this. It acts through all the social influences that drag us down, that implant in our imaginations false ideas of God, that encourage unlawful and anti-social desires, that divert our impulses into wrong channels.'

And all leads at last to God's remedy for sin. 'In its essential nature the problem of sin remains unaffected by modern knowledge. Sin is still sin against God. It still needs redemption and forgiveness, and we believe that in Christ alone we have the remedy for the situation. We can still repeat the old text, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins."'

The City and the Sanctuary.

BY PROFESSOR THE REVEREND W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D.

IN the *Princeton Theological Review* of July 1922, Mr. C. M. Mackay has published a long and careful discussion of the measurements for the city and the Temple which Ezekiel has left us in his last chapter. Most readers of the prophet, who have toiled through the sections dealing with the ground plan and elevation of the visionary shrine, the materials for the sacrifices and the incomes of the

hierarchy, find their interest somewhat exhausted when they reach the redistribution of the land as a whole, and the actual measurements of the spacious domains of the priesthood and the prince. But it is dangerous to regard anything in Ezekiel as uninteresting; and Mr. Mackay's arithmetical calculations, if accepted, will lead to conclusions of great importance, both for Ezekiel and for the Judaism

of which he may rightly be called the chief better.

It will be best to begin by summarizing Mr. Mackay's points. (1) In 42¹⁶, 45¹, and 48⁸, he assumes that 'reeds,' as in both A.V. and R.V., is right, and 'cubits,' which all modern commentators prefer, wrong.

(2) He understands that the new Eastern border of the land is laid down, in 47¹⁸, as stretching in a line from Damascus to the Dead Sea, instead of following the Jordan.

(3) He places the site of the Priests' portion of the 'Oblation,' containing the Temple itself, at the North of the 'Oblation,' and not, as generally supposed, at the centre.

(4) He takes the site of the new city to overlap the site of the actual Jerusalem; but he places the site of the Temple 30 miles or so to the North, at Shechem. If the first and third points are correct, the new Temple will have to be placed 30 miles North of the city. It follows that the stream which issues from the Temple does not take the course of the Kidron, but of the Wady Farah, which flows East from Shechem into the Jordan valley.

(5) Thus, the site of the great altar on Mount Moriah was to be left bare. It was indeed regarded by Ezekiel with the reverse of veneration. While the city of Zion was looked upon as the abode of the ark, the real home of the altar was at Shechem; and it is to the iniquities of the kings of Northern Israel, whose capital was at Shechem, that reference is made in 43⁷⁻⁹ ('the carcasses of their kings in their high places').¹

(6) The actual results for geography will bring us to Bethlehem as the centre of the city, 35 miles South of Mount Ebal, while the centre of the domain of the Levites (who 'went astray') will be at Bethel. The whole city is 10 miles square, and the Oblation is a square of 50 miles, a very considerable portion of the whole country. It may be noticed that 'Zion' is thus on the North (instead of on the South-West) of the city; which seems to correspond with Ps 48² ('on the sides of the north').

Mr. Mackay writes with much good-humoured contempt of the 'critics' and commentators; but

¹ Mr. Mackay claims that the Shechem site must be understood to include other towns in its neighbourhood, such as Tirzah and Samaria, where kings were actually buried, while in Jerusalem it was the good rather than the bad kings who were buried near the Temple.

it is easy to see that his views are much more revolutionary than any which recent commentators on Ezekiel have thought of suggesting; they imply enormous claims for the priestly revenues; they suggest that Ezekiel was at variance with what has hitherto been understood as the general prophetic attitude to the future of Jerusalem, and that indeed he was the father, not of Judaism, but of Samaritanism. Are we forced to a conclusion so novel, and even disturbing?

Let us begin with the last three points, and take them together. Ezekiel makes it perfectly clear that he intended the Temple to be separated from the city; did he mean to separate it from its ancient site, and to transfer it, enlarged to a building covering an area over a mile square, to Mount Ebal? ² It is quite true that in the earlier centuries of Israel's history Ephraim was the leading tribe, and Shechem was more important to the Hebrews than the Jebusite stronghold of Jerusalem. It is also true that the verdict of Hosea and even Amos on the Northern Kingdom was not the verdict of the Deuteronomic historians. Jeremiah, himself a son of the North rather than the South, has devoted one of his most striking poems to the return of the Northern tribes (Jer 30 f.). But not a word is said by them, or any other prophets, as to the substitution of the long desolated Northern sanctuary for Jerusalem as the seat of the worship of Jehovah. None of the prophetic denunciations of the wickedness of Zion threatened this last indignity. And was Shechem regarded by any of the prophets, even by the Ephraimite Hosea, as an ancient but deserted sanctuary of Jehovah? If Ezekiel, as Mr. Mackay reminds us, used language of Judah that was all but unprintable (ch. 16), his opinion of her Northern sister, save perhaps in the way of rhetoric, was no better. If, on the other hand, Ezekiel was understood to have contemplated this transference, how unintelligible would be the glowing hopes of Deutero-Isaiah, and the conduct of the Jews of the Return. Nor can we well set against this the fact that the phrase, 'the head of the mountains,' as the seat of Jehovah's house (Is 2², Mic 4¹) occurs also in the blessing of Joseph, or that the districts mentioned in Ps 60^{6,7}, all occur in the 'fifty-mile square of the Terumah' or Oblation. In so wide a region, a large number

² Mr. Mackay points out that the expression in 40² does not fit the site of the Temple at Jerusalem; if so, it fits the Shechem site even less.

of the most familiar places in the country are situated. Nor can the suggested identification of Shechem with Salem (on the strength of the LXX of Gn 33¹⁸), or the connexion between Zadok and Melchizedek, King of Salem (or Shechem), be considered more than very dubious. It is not too much to say that evidence much stronger than these passages would be needed to establish an interpretation of Ezekiel which would detach him so far from his predecessors and his followers. Did not every Jew hold that 'in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship'? But no Samaritan is known to have claimed the authority of Ezekiel for the place of his sanctuary.

Here, however, Mr. Mackay would remind us that there is more evidence to be found; and that, to find it, he has simply taken the text of Ezekiel as it stands. It is true that in the three passages mentioned in our first point, 'reeds' occurs and not 'cubits.' (Since a reed contains six cubits, the familiar measurements must, on Mr. Mackay's view, be multiplied by six.) But in the first of the three passages, 42¹⁶, 'cubits' must be right (as the LXX suggests), since it is only by that reading that we can make the measurements tally with those given elsewhere (cf. v.²⁰, where the Hebrew omits 'reeds,' and 40²¹⁻³⁷). In 45¹, 'reeds' is a mere insertion of the English translators; but 'cubits' occurs in v.², showing decisively what length the prophet had in mind. Nor does 'reeds' occur, either in the M.T. or the LXX of chap. 48^{8ff.} It thus appears that the only MS. support for 'reeds' is in 42¹⁶, where the Massoretic 'reeds' can only stand in conflict with earlier measurements; and indeed the text is not above suspicion, nor are we justified in summarily discarding the LXX for the M.T. Mr. Mackay asks why the angel should use a reed to measure cubits (v.¹⁶); but that he had done so already is certainly implied by 40^{5ff.}

Keeping, then, to the traditional 'cubits,' we find the dimensions less startling. The whole Oblation covers a square not of 50 miles, but of rather less than 8 miles; and the Temple area is not a square of a mile, but of some 300 yards. Further, as we shall see, the portion containing the Oblation and the Prince's domain is not, then, as it is on Mr. Mackay's reckoning, out of all proportion to the tribal territories.

The remaining points, two and three, need not detain us so long. Ezekiel's language in describing the Eastern frontier of the country (47¹⁸) is so

obscure that the text can hardly be right. The LXX differs considerably. Various conjectures have been made. It is clear that since the line starts on the North-East from a spot (Hazar-Hattikon) between Damascus and the Hauran, that part of the frontier at least must have been East of Jordan; but it is equally possible that the line passed rapidly to the upper reaches of the Jordan. Mr. Mackay refers to the need of drawing a line parallel to the Mediterranean coast-line if the tribal territories are to be equal; but such a line would correspond to no natural feature across Jordan; and where the Mediterranean coast turns sharply to the West near the Wady el-Arish, the parallel would have to be deserted. Mr. Mackay urges that the country East of the Jordan had always been regarded as part of Israel: but his line would cut right through the territories regarded as assigned to Reuben, Gad, and part of Manasseh.

Was the most holy part of the Oblation on the Northern side of the Oblation as a whole, or in the centre of it? Chap. 48⁸ certainly implies that the Temple was in the centre of the whole Oblation, and not comparatively near to its Northern border. And while the prophet's general order in description is from North to South, there is surely no necessity that he should follow the same order when he has reached the Oblation and is describing its special structure. The point is not a very important one for the measurements of the land, when we take 'cubits' rather than 'reeds.' But, in spite of Mr. Mackay's suggested gradation from the less to the more holy in the Oblation, *i.e.* from the city, and then the Levites' domain, to the Priests' domain and the Temple itself, it is hard to think that Ezekiel would have placed his most holy section anywhere save in the centre of the sacred estate.

We can now compare the actual arrangement of the whole land, according to Mr. Mackay, and to the older view. What were to be its boundaries? The Eastern boundary we have already discussed; the Northern would seem to have passed along a line from near Tyre, South of Hermon, and on to the region, perhaps, of the modern Hajj road. The West was the seacoast, and the Southern line started near the Wady el-Arish and passed to the region South of the Dead Sea. The whole territory, from North to South, measures about 160 miles. It is divided between the Oblation and the Twelve Tribes, each tribe possessing a strip of equal breadth, and presumably, Mr. Mackay would add, length;

even tribes have their strips North of the Oblation, and five South. There are 65 miles between Mr. Mackay's Oblation and the Northern frontier; this will allow each tribe a strip about 9 miles broad; and 40 miles between the Oblation and the Southern frontier, allowing each of the five tribes a strip some 8 miles broad. On the older arrangement, measuring by cubits and placing the centre of the Oblation at Jerusalem, the strip of each of the Northern tribes will be 14 miles broad, and of each of the Southern tribes, 10 miles broad, the Oblation-strip being 8 miles broad. But it is doubtful whether at this point Ezekiel was thinking of topography at all. How could the tribes, if they did return, be uprooted from their old habitations? How could Judah, who had formed a 'kingdom' to itself, be content with no more than Simeon, a tribe which had long since ceased to exist at all? And how could a land so varied in contour, climate, and fertility as Palestine, be equitably divided up in this aggrammatic fashion? Clearly Ezekiel is far from being out of touch with actuality. The question to which this discussion leads is of considerable importance. What did Ezekiel envisage? How did he keep to what had been familiar to him and his hearers? On any interpretation, he introduced surprising novelties. The rearrangement of tribes, the mathematical distribution of their territory, taking no account of the fertile regions of the centre of the land or the barren stretches to the South, and the separation between the Temple and the city, are sensational enough even if we keep to the traditional view. But at least, the sites of city and Temple would be in the old familiar country, and the structure and dimensions of the Temple are very similar to those of Solomon's Temple, which Ezekiel and his public would know by heart. Each of the alterations introduced by Ezekiel has its basis in the prophet's desire for symmetry or for unity. On the other hand, on Mr. Mackay's arrangement, apart from the immense proportion of the country taken up by the Oblation, we cannot but wonder at the audacity which would plan out a city stretching more than half-way along the road from Jerusalem to Hebron, and right down along the defiles into the Jordan valley, and which would force the Temple, outsoaring all the well-known proportions of its predecessor, to cover an area of a square mile.

The truth is that there is a curious mixture of the exact and the vague in all Ezekiel's visions,

as there is indeed in his addresses. Details he sees very clearly—so clearly that he is always challenging us to draw diagrams; how they will all fit into one picture he does not trouble to ask. This is plain enough to every student of the vision of the cloud-chariot in chaps. 1 and 10. The love of symmetry and diagram, with its limitations, is equally clear in the argument in chap. 18. Further, there is always a striking contrast between the prophet's concentration on the focus of consciousness and the mistiness of the periphery. Thanks to this concentration, we know the details of the new Temple better than we know the details of Solomon's structure. But in the frontiers of the country and the holdings of the different tribes Ezekiel was plainly not interested. His language—so far as we can recover it—is hurried and ambiguous; just the sort of language to induce textual corruption.

The same combination is seen in the description of the new river (47²⁸); it is to flow directly from the city to the East, and in less than a mile and a half it has risen to more than the height of a man; how it accomplished this, and how it proceeded through the remaining 15 miles or so of its course (whether from Shechem or Jerusalem), Ezekiel does not pause to consider.¹ Again, the salt industry around the Dead Sea is not to come to an end; but the manner of the division between the sweetened and the still salt waters is clearly 'peripheral.' We are reminded of the description of the burial of the corpses of the host of Gog (ch. 39), where, after provision has been made for all that ritual holiness could require, the picture is, so to speak, shut off.

The reader is involuntarily reminded of the contrasts in the dream-consciousness. Long before the psycho-analysts made the structure of every dream the work of a fascinating phantom army of desires and fears, most people were familiar with the way in which details will stand out against—nothing at all, and the experiences and ideas of the past day or days will appear in wholly impossible yet (as it seems at the time) entirely natural combinations. It is not to be supposed that the last nine chapters of Ezekiel are a normal (or even an

¹ Mr. Mackay urges that the language of 47²⁸ would fit the Wady Farah, but not a river flowing East from Jerusalem. This is by no means certain. The phrase 'the two rivers' need not refer to the Farah and the Jordan, now united; it is rather an error, introduced from Zec 14⁸. LXX reads 'the river.'

abnormal) dream ; but they are put before us as a vision rather than an ordinary waking experience (cf. 11th), and in this as in other visions, Ezekiel's mind certainly seems to obey some of the laws of the dream. Doubtless, it 'hangs together' as no dream ever did ; but one can see, at least in part, how the splendid and unearthly building came to be. It grew silently, like its predecessor, without sound of hammer or axe. Ezekiel knew every line, every stone, of the building on Moriah ; he had pondered over every structural arrangement that made misuse of the holy place horribly possible ; and in his twenty-six years of exile in Mesopotamia, his recollections of the Temple, as keen as if he had been absent only for a day, had lived on side by side with his perception of the possibilities, for purposes of

order and symmetry, of a vast and well-watered plain. Though the mountains remained as dear to him as ever (see especially ch. 36), the plain had distinct advantages if the land was to be plotted out satisfactorily, with the Temple as near the centre of the land as it could well be. And in a vision, the glory of the mountains and the convenience of the plain could unite.

Mr. Mackay would not perhaps object to this vision-psychology ; he holds, indeed, that under his view of the arrangement of the land, there is no impracticability ; but under any view, and certainly under his view of the vast space of the city, and the mighty Temple platform on the top of Mount Ebal, nothing could be done unless it were possible to 'sink the mountain to a plain.'

Literature.

THE CHURCH IN AMERICA.

PROFESSOR W. ADAMS BROWN has written a great book on a great subject. *The Church in America* (Macmillan ; 14s. net) is a study of the present condition and future prospects of American Protestantism. During the war Professor Adams Brown was Chairman of the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, and thereafter Secretary of the General War-time Commission of the Churches. No man has had a finer opportunity of surveying the religious situation, and he has made full use of it. He has not only collected the facts but he has mastered them. Here are no masses of undigested statistics, but a living picture of the Church in America as the War found it, of its manifold war work, and of all it both hoped and failed to do when the War was over.

For the sheer joy of it let us quote the story of one man who made good. 'One of the finest pieces of work done in the War was done by a Presbyterian minister over sixty years of age, who entered one of the large industrial establishments in a Western city as a welfare worker. Through his tact and resourcefulness he so altered the morale of the workers that the output of the plant more than doubled. Yet this same man had been seeking a church in vain for years.'

The major part of the book is occupied with a

survey of the vast problems that confront the Church at home and abroad, in city and country, in the fields of intellectual and social life. Professor Adams Brown has thought long and deeply on these problems, and his thinking never loses contact with the world of actual facts. It is the situation as it presents itself in America that is directly in view, but the problems that face the Church in Britain are essentially the same, and so are the principles that must govern a true solution.

America, it seems, has its problem of rural depopulation and over-churching in an aggravated form. Witness the State of Ohio with 2807 churches, 37 per cent. of which have less than fifty members, or the State of Missouri, where only 4 per cent. of the country churches have resident ministers. 'Yet in these same communities there may be two, three, or even four or five different church buildings standing side by side.' This is one of the factors which make Church Union a pressing question. Professor Adams Brown treats this subject in a most illuminating and suggestive way. It is, in fact, the thesis to which his book is devoted. He holds it to be vital 'that we re-think our doctrine of the Church.' Not that we should continue our discussion of Church unity in the abstract, but we must determine what should be the function of the Church in our democratic society and come to a

definite understanding as to how the existing churches can see this function adequately discharged.

The following sentences on the League of Nations are significant as expressing the mind of the Church in America. 'The acclamation with which the proposal of the League was received in the most widely separated circles, no less than the deep despondency and even despair with which its momentary failure has been followed, is the best witness to the fact that it touched some deeper chord than is reached by our conventional politics ; that it expressed those underlying yearnings which belong not to any one nation or group of nations, but to man as man ; that, in short, its appeal passed beyond politics into religion. . . . While it is true that the recent campaign against the League has led many of its former advocates to recognise weaknesses and dangers in its present form which will need to be corrected, those who are responsible for the present conduct of the nation's affairs will make a grave mistake if they interpret the present disposition of their constituency to allow them large latitude in finding the way in which that correction can be made, as indicating any loss of faith in the central purpose for which the League was created or any weakening of the will to realise it.'

THE INTEREST OF THE BIBLE.

The Interest of the Bible, by Professor J. E. McFadyen (Hodder & Stoughton ; 7s. 6d.), is a challenging title ; for, obviously, it requires a more than usually interesting book to carry it successfully. But it is just such a book that Dr. McFadyen has given us. These eighteen fine papers afford further evidence of the width and precision of his scholarship, of the characteristic balance of his mind, and of the singular lucidity of his style. Specially attractive is a catholic-minded study of Hellenism and Hebraism, where his classical learning finds scope, and lands him on some points on very different conclusions from what were once accepted, as a comparison with certain famous passages in 'Ecce Homo,' for example, will make clear ; or the moving character-sketch of Saul. When A. B. Davidson was at New College his most famous lecture was on Saul, and once a year the other professors, facing nearly empty benches, uncomplainingly accepted the explanation that their various classes were all listening to it ! Only

Davidson himself resented it, and has been known to substitute a dry discussion on some point of syntax, finally looking round the crowded room with a mischievous smile. Dr. McFadyen also leaves Saul one of the most pathetic figures in history—this phlegmatic brooding youth, so he conceives him, who, suddenly fired by the splendour of the conception of the Kingdom, gave for it all he had in an eager passion of religious enthusiasm that burned up his life, and, even when believing himself outcast from God, one who had sinned the unpardonable sin, still laboured on with a fine desperate zeal for his ideal. There are five detailed studies of communion with God, what that meant for the prophets, in the Historical Books, and in the Psalms, for Jesus Christ, and in the New Testament church ; or, to name only one more, 'the preacher,' says Dr. McFadyen, 'tends to develop the homiletic mind at the expense of his historical conscience,' like the Chronicler who arrives at 'a much simpler and smoother conception of the divine government of the world than is yielded by the stubborn facts themselves,' and therewith he launches out on a fascinating study of History and Homiletics. This is, perhaps, the best book Dr. McFadyen has yet given us.

KANT.

A new book by James Ward is always welcome. Among those who have striven in recent times to make works on Philosophy not only intelligible but interesting, he takes a high place. We rejoice that he has brought to bear upon Kant the instruments of his clear thought and clear literary style. For it is well worth while to understand Kant ; and Kant's thought, as he himself expressed it, is most elusive owing to the execrable literary form in which he clothed it. For a true understanding of Kant, however, more is needful than a clear exposition of his great treatises. Kant was a voluminous writer, and he wrote on a bewildering variety of topics. His minor works are very little known in this country. In Germany in recent years there has been a great amount of patient study of all that Kant published, and that study was worth undertaking, for it casts much light on the Kantian philosophy. Our author knows the results of all that intensive investigation and discussion, and in the light of them he is able to present us with such a clear-sighted view

of Kant's thought and of the vacillations it underwent as makes us wish that it had been treated in the fuller measure to which Ward confesses he at one time looked forward. Such as it is, however, the book is one for which all students of Kant will be grateful. The title is *A Study of Kant* (Cambridge: at the Univ. Press; 12s. 6d. net).

BISHOP MOULE.

The late Bishop Moule was a scholar, a saint, and (in the true sense) a Christian gentleman. This is the impression left on the mind of a reader by the substantial biography which has been written by Canon Hartford and Canon Macdonald: *Handley Carr Glyn Moule, Bishop of Durham* (Hodder & Stoughton; 20s. net). This was the estimate of the Bishop which was commonly held by the Christian public before the *Life* appeared, so widely known and so highly esteemed was its subject in all the churches. What the writers have done, and done admirably, is to confirm and illuminate by many interesting details the general opinion, and also to reveal clearly the influences which helped to shape so notable a personality.

One of these influences was the future Bishop's home life, of which a beautiful picture is given in the book. It was a home of piety and learning, where the children learned not only to love God, but to love good literature and to value sound scholarship. One of the finest things the writers have to tell is the fact that twice over, when young Moule was on the top of a wave of success and influence at Cambridge, he threw everything over to go home and bury himself for years in his father's parish in order to relieve somewhat his father's burden of labour. We can trace to these early years the habit of accurate scholarship which was to bear such fine fruit in his published works.

The other formative influence in his life was his own definite religious experience. Dr. Moule was for long the recognized leader of the Evangelicals in England. It might be said of him, what was said of another prominent man in connexion with Temperance, that he made evangelical opinion respectable. His theology was rooted in an experience which was so sincere and so deep that it never ceased to show itself in his life. This is what won for him so much respect, and even reverence, from those who differed widely from him in conviction. It produced in him a strong sense of

duty and a patient tolerance of those who opposed him, which are repeatedly illustrated by his biographers. One of the best of these instances is given in connexion with his difficult relations with one of his clergy at Durham. They had acute controversies which frequently threatened to end in an open breach. After the worst of these the clergyman received a short letter from the Bishop, offering him an important living and in the kindest words of appreciation. 'Well,' he said to his wife, 'he is a man after all, a man that can bear no grudge.' For years afterwards the Bishop had no more devoted friend and supporter in the diocese.

Dr. Moule was, perhaps, not a great man or a great Bishop, but his writings have nourished and sustained a religious experience in multitudes both inside and outside his own communion; his work as Principal of Ridley Hall drew many young men into the ministry of the Church, and can be traced to-day in many influential lives; and his personal character has been an inspiration to men of different schools. The life of such a man was well worth writing, and in this volume the work has been well and truly done.

WHICH ARE THE TWELVE GREATEST CHRISTIAN CLASSICS?

Lamb, that huge reader, admits in one of his letters, 'I take less pleasure in books than heretofore, but I like books about books.' Professor R. E. Welsh has issued a notable volume belonging to that order. *Classics of the Soul's Quest* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net) is a fine title; and these studies of some twelve or so of the spiritual masterpieces are worthy of it. In each case there is, with bibliographies attached, a sufficient account of the author's life and times, a careful and scholarly synopsis of the book or books under review, and some indication of the part they have played in the world's history, all prefaced by an informing introduction, and ending in a discussion on the distinctiveness of Christian experience. Dr. Welsh' wide reading and alert and interesting mind are well known; and he has put both of them into his work. It would hardly be possible to be dull with such a theme; but here, at all events, the reader is swept along in admiration of the author's deftness. Moreover, since one cannot deal with the whole of an inexhaustible field, but must pick and choose, the selection made gives an added interest.

by its inevitable revelation of the man who so selects. Were you to name the twelve greatest Christian spiritual classics, what would your list be? Dr. Welsh votes for Augustine, Dante, Tauler, *Theologia Germanica*, à Kempis, Bunyan, Law, Behmen, Wesley, Tolstoy, Pater's *Marius the Epicurean*, and Rabindranath Tagore. Evidently, therefore, while reasonably orthodox, he is up to date. He has no great liking for the French mind, relegating Pascal and, more reasonably, Amiel to a couple of pages in the appendix; while the other masters, Fénelon, St. Francis of Sales, and the rest are overlooked. No women are included, except hurriedly in the few pages of small print. He does not care for Letters; and, as is right, he has his favourites. Dante gets seventy pages, the *Theologia Germanica* five; to Tagore or *Marius* is allotted as much space as to Bunyan or à Kempis, and almost as much as to Law, Wesley, and Behmen squeezed together. Upon the whole he seems to prefer those whose mysticism is not too intrusive.

It is a goodly fellowship, a great and honouring possession. And Dr. Welsh makes clear that it in no way exhausts Jesus Christ, that coming ages will produce classics as deep and splendid, which will be no mere echoes of our own, but real originals, breaking fresh ground, and viewing our Lord in new aspects. At present he admits a dearth of works of the first rank. But he is wisely sure that, when the East is won for Christ, they will appear there; and in the West he feels that Tolstoy is the forerunner of a new type of spiritual classic, less self-absorbed, and personal and individualistic, that will give utterance to that sense of brotherhood, that call to service, that more acute social conscience, which, he feels, are what give Christianity a main appeal to modern men and women.

THE CHRISTIAN HYPOTHESIS.

'It is common for less thoughtful teachers of religion to set faith and reason in contrast or even in opposition, and at the lowest level of such teaching faith is exalted and reason is all but denounced.' The quotation is from *The Christian Hypothesis*, by Edward Campbell Tainsh (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net). We can all bear witness to its truth. We have heard proud reason denounced as the enemy of simple faith, and this has been a stumbling to many, an occasion of perplexity or of stout-hearted rebellion. It is the aim of the writer to con-

tribute towards a permanent settlement of this recurring dispute, by showing that 'faith is an activity of man within his reason, not a gift received in passivity, not a non-reasoned conviction projected by God into the consciousness.' The whole book is a fine piece of closely-knit argument, and every sentence is packed with thought.

Here is one of the all-too-rare illustrations: 'Climbing a mountain is an activity of man in his muscles. There are many activities of man in his muscles which are not climbing a mountain. If it were pitch dark, a man could not well climb a mountain, nor could he if he were drunk or very ill or in a state of starvation. Notwithstanding all these, climbing a mountain is an activity of man in his muscles. There are many activities of man in his reason which are not faith, and there are many hindrances to faith in the man himself. None the less, faith may be an activity of a man within his reason.' The climber, to follow the illustration, is not left to toil upward in pitch darkness. 'God hath shined.' But is the climber himself spiritually fit? He may be drunk with prejudice, fevered with pride, starving in selfishness, or disabled in some way for his high enterprise. In particular, he may lack the honest and good heart which is an essential condition of the discernment of spiritual truth. But if he have that, he is required to take no wild leap in the dark, but may travel to faith by the road of reason.

What is the practical bearing of all this? It is that faith is a duty and an act of man—a duty and an act possible only through the illumination of the Holy Spirit, but performed through the honest exercise of right reason. 'It would therefore seem that, not by the reviling of human reason but by summoning it into the regions of holiness and worship, religion can best be helped.'

REMINISCENCES OF A ROTHSCHILD.

'I have always been of opinion that there cannot be too many Rothschilds'—so Lord Beaconsfield once wrote to a member of the famous family of bankers. So long as they number among them gentlewomen of the high character of Lady Battersea, the elder daughter of Sir Anthony Rothschild, who has just published her *Reminiscences* (Macmillan; 21s. net), we wholly agree with him.

She has a notable ancestry on both her father's and her mother's side, for the latter was a Monte-

flore. She has lived a very full life, not only in London society as a great entertainer, but as one very actively engaged in work among the Jewish population of the East End, and also in temperance and other philanthropic work, to which she has given largely both of her time and of her ample means.

Lady Battersea writes of her father that 'The Rothschilds were in his eyes people apart from all others.' 'His Jewish proclivities brought him into touch with the philanthropic and educational work of his race, who at that time were just beginning to emerge from their life of separation. In my childhood the Jews were still suffering from civil and religious disabilities; they had no very assured social standing and there was in many quarters a deep-seated prejudice against them. My family, while remaining true to their religion, established a firm footing in the social and political life of their country.' It is obviously from her mother that Lady Battersea derives her inspiration to follow after good works. She writes: 'Hers was a fine spiritual nature, rising above all sectarianism, even above racial bias, and claiming affinity with the noblest minds of every creed.' She read with pleasure the sermons of Martineau, Parker, and Robertson, feeling some kinship with the Unitarians, but she was also much attracted by the Society of Friends.

Lady Battersea and her sister were brought up according to Mid-Victorian ideas, but she feels that 'increased independence has brought into many lives a wider sphere of influence for mind and character, and therefore a surer prospect of well-earned happiness.' She and her sister married Englishmen outside the pale of Jewry. Her husband, Mr. Cyril Flower, was appointed, by Mr. Gladstone, Junior Liberal Whip. He was one of the two best-looking men in the House of Commons of his time, popular with all parties. For his efficient services Mr. Gladstone gave him a peerage, greatly to his wife's disappointment, as her ambitions for her husband were very different.

Lady Battersea inherited, with her share of the Rothschild millions, their disposition for entertaining. It is a wonderful gallery of notables to which she introduces us in these *Reminiscences*, ranging from King Edward, Queen Alexandra, and the Princess Louise, as intimate friends, to a succession of Prime Ministers of both political parties, and eminent men and women of letters.

She is charmed with 'Dizzy' and even with 'Mary Anne,' for 'if foolish, and at times even ridiculous, she was a splendid wife.' She reverences Mr. Gladstone and Mrs. Gladstone, 'that wonderful couple'; and no sign of party prejudice is apparent in her pen-portraits of such diverse personalities as Mr. Balfour, who will only read novels that end happily; Lord Rosebery, the husband of her cousin, Hannah de Rothschild, 'one of the most devoted and unselfish wives that ever lived'; 'C.B.' with his devotion to his ailing wife, and his liking for French novels and knowledge of French literature; and Mr. Asquith and his first wife, 'a true homemaker and home-keeper and an excellent mother.' She finds it a difficult task to give a portrait of the present Mrs. Asquith, 'a most original, dazzling, and astonishing' personality.

The most remarkable characteristic of all that we are told of the cosmopolitan crowd that passes through the four hundred and fifty pages of this book is that there is almost nothing but what is of good report. The writer is not uncritical, but she has the gift of charity. She delights to see her guests at their best, and so to depict them. Lady Battersea was undoubtedly a hostess of great charm. That charm she has also given to these *Reminiscences* of a crowded, an interesting, and a useful life.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF GEORGE FOX.

Every rightly constituted mind is immediately prejudiced in favour of a book issued with an introductory note in which, amid much praise, it is frankly admitted that the 'thesis contains some crudities and extravagances,' and 'obvious instances' of 'needlessly elaborate psychological or even physiological interpretation of expressions used by Fox, which bear a simpler explanation.' For one thing, such honesty creates a strong presumption that the praise is likely to be trustworthy. And so in this case it is. There are things in *The Founder of Quakerism*, by Rachel Knight, Ph.D. (Swarthmore Press; 12s. 6d. net), that are somewhat irritating; diagrams, which to some minds are quite unhelpful and somewhat uncouth, and repetitions here and there that give the impression that the book must have been originally a series of separate studies that have been welded into a whole, not quite perfectly.

but the study of Fox, that queer amalgam of conflicting qualities, is thorough and patient and laborately careful. Here is no mere blind hero-worship, but an honest and discriminating bit of first-hand investigation, which brings vividly before one the bigness and wonder of the man, and yet somehow, probably quite unconsciously, leaves an impression of him not altogether pleasant.

The attempted analysis of his particular type of mysticism is a bold endeavour in a field in which not very much has yet been done, and is, perhaps, not so successful. One has the feeling that things are being overstrained; that the author, as the critics say, is pressing. Thus, in a chapter on the hypersensitivity of Fox's senses, remarkable instances of this are heaped together in the most haphazard way with things that mean nothing at all, such as 'the mosquitoes on the Rhode Island shore were very troublesome to him.' Often there are elaborate explanations of perfectly simple facts, and sometimes the book is written quite unnecessarily in a quasi-scientific jargon that is not English. The author has an eager interest in our ever-increasing knowledge of the extent to which character can be traced back to bodily functions and peculiarities. But sometimes this is overdone. Fox's eyes, like the Master's, greatly impressed people. Dr. Knight gives various instances of folk crying out to him to turn them away, as they felt pierced by them; and she remarks, 'His eyes often glowed with the inner stimulation that comes from a virile blood supply and perhaps also from active glandular secretions.' Fox had 'a sight and sense of the King's return' before it happened. Here, it seems to me, the kinæsthetic motor process caused the cortical excitation of the visual centre calling forth such a visual image with its accompanying kinæsthetic feeling which he interprets as a sense of prophetic revelation.' So now we understand it. This kind of thing, when carried into the inner recesses of spiritual sanctities, is not successful. You see, men say, tearing some delicate bloom to pieces, this is the calyx, this the corona, these the stamens, and so on, and, yes, that's all. But that withering little heap is not the flower; the something that made it has escaped them. And when Fox has been duly dissected in this vivisectional fashion, the wonder of him still escapes, is not to be pinned down, like a dead butterfly.

THE CRITICS CRITICISED.

One suspects that Dr. Fitchett hugely enjoyed writing *Where the Higher Criticism Fails* (Epworth Press; 4s.), which sweeps along with not a little of the rush of 'Deeds that Won the Empire.' Although no opponent of Higher Criticism in itself, he holds a very orthodox position; and, feeling that there are many treacherous bogs about, advances cautiously, tapping every foot of ground before he will commit himself to it, sometimes rather comically, where to most eyes it looks sound enough. For what worries him is the utter recklessness with which theories are too often spun by the dozen out of airy nothings, and flung down dogmatically without any kind of proof except simple assertion, or the exercise of unchastened imagination. Where criticism fails, he feels, is partly through its curious lack of humour; and he makes great play, on the one hand, with the weird fantasies of a Preserved Smith or a Venturini, and, on the other, with the extreme caution of Canon Barnes' references to our Lord, which strike him as a rather cramped and unimpressive testimonial, the kind of thing that one might offer on behalf of an ordinary student of average intelligence and gifts. His own humour, always hearty, sometimes really clever, is on occasion almost boisterous. Even upon the road to Emmaus he cracks a jest, in itself an admirable one; only there one would prefer to walk in reverent silence. And on the whole one has the feeling that the world is a more puzzling place, and some things more manysided, than Dr. Fitchett seems to think.

There are three roads to peace recommended to those who are grievously troubled. There is the path of Christian Science, which counsels them to ignore and deny the reality of the ills from the illusion of which they suffer. There is the way of trying to be strong, and in our own strength overcoming. Then there is the solution of Faith in Christ. To show the futility of the first two and the success of the third is the purpose of Mrs. Horace Porter, who writes *The Christian Science of Thought* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net).

The Rev. Thomas E. Miller of Dunfermline has written, and Messrs. Allenson have published, a

third volume of Bible Portraits. We have already had *Portraits of Women of the Bible* and *Portraits of Women of the New Testament*, and we now have *Portraits of Men of the Old Testament* (6s. net). This volume contains lectures on twelve Old Testament heroes, ranging from Othniel to Samuel. Mr. Miller accepts the 'narratives as they have come down to us,' retells the stories, and draws some sound lessons.

The University Press at Cambridge has sent out a full and scholarly study of *The Sixty-eighth Psalm* (8s. 6d. net), comprising an introduction, a revised translation and critical notes, by W. W. Cannon. It is a fine piece of work, in every way worthy of Cambridge learning. The introduction, extending to forty-one large pages, discusses the different interpretations of the psalm and the dates to which it has been assigned, deciding for the period of the restoration from exile. The psalm is an expression of the joy and hope that possessed the people, who were once more in possession of their own city. The translation is not only accurate but dignified and impressive, and the book is beautifully printed.

A pleasing missionary book for children has been published by the C.M.S. with the title *The Magic Dog*. The writer is G. C. Beach, and he certainly has the gift. The different nations of the world are described in their manners and customs, and the whole thing is so skilfully strung upon a thread of story, and so charmingly illustrated by little sketches in the text, that the average child will not realize that he is imbibing knowledge and missionary interest at the same time. The book is prettily got up and would make a pleasing gift for young people.

James Urquhart, F.S.A.(Scot.), is the recognized exponent of the teaching of William Honyman Gillespie. Gillespie's *a priori* argument for the Being and attributes of God can never be popularized, but it has profoundly influenced certain types of mind. Dr. John Clifford has confessed, 'In my college days I was specially helped by Mr. Gillespie's great work. A wave of scepticism had swept over my mind and carried away my faith in God. Gillespie's argument recovered it, and steadied my intellectual movements for years.' Mr. Urquhart has now edited *The Parerga of William*

Honyman Gillespie (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net). The book is a labour of love, and it is well to have preserved these minor works of one whose name will ever occupy a respectable place on the roll of Scottish philosophers.

Life's Transient Dream is a volume containing fourteen brief practical discourses by David Russell Kyd, who was for fifty-eight years minister of Foulis Wester in Perthshire (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). There is a short introduction by Dr. Wallace Williamson.

The Diocesan Press (formerly the S.P.C.K.) in Madras has never published a better biography—small though it is—than *Ragland Pioneer*, by Amy Wilson Carmichael. The authoress does not trouble to chronicle external happenings. She gets at the very heart of the man, and we feel with her that 'it might all have happened yesterday; for times change and customs; phrases pass, our very speech takes to itself new dress, the old sounds outworn to us, but the great elemental things of life do not change at all; like earth, air, water, fire, they abide unaltered and unalterable.' The little Life is living from cover to cover.

One of the best missionary books issued during the season is *Missionary Heroes of Africa*, by the Rev. J. H. Morrison (Doran; \$1.50). Mr. Morrison has other well-known missionary books to his credit, but none of them will be more popular than this one, in which the writer tells, with graphic pen, the life-story of missionaries like Moffat, Livingstone, Laws, Mackay, Grenfell, Coillard, Mary Slessor. The book is written for the young, and we cannot imagine a better book for the purpose of interesting them in missions. The lives of these great men and women are a fascinating record as mere biography, and this fascination loses nothing at the hands of Mr. Morrison.

Dr. Frederick F. Shannon, who has succeeded Dr. Dwight Hillis and Dr. F. W. Gunsaulus as minister of the Central Church, Chicago, has collected some of the sermons preached by him on special occasions, giving the volume the title *Sermons for Days We Observe*. Though we do not observe all the days here—for Dr. Shannon has a sermon for Lincoln's birthday, Washington's birthday, Grant's

birthday, and Mother's Day (it seems a pity we do not observe the last)—something of value may be got from each address. Take this story from the one on Lincoln. 'A Springfield neighbour was drawn to his door one day by the crying of children. He saw Mr. Lincoln passing by with two of his sons, both yelling lustily. "Why, what is the matter with the boys?" he inquired. "Just what is the matter with the whole world," answered Lincoln. "I've got three walnuts, and each wants two."' The book is attractively got up in blue with red lettering, by the George H. Doran Company (\$1.50).

One of the most hopeful activities of our time is the effort to popularize theology. This is as it should be, for the Bible is every man's library, and its message is addressed not to the expert but to the man in the street. In *The Essentials of Christianity* (Doran; \$2), Professor Henry C. Sheldon, D.D., supplies a simple and non-technical treatment of the great doctrines of the Christian faith. His theses are: '(1) Man, as being constitutionally a religious being, must in the long run have a religion. (2) Christianity is distinctly superior to any other historic religion. (3) The essential truths and spirit of Christianity are so high and perfect that there is no real occasion to harbour the thought of their being improved upon.' Throughout the book there are manifest a sound judgment, a ripe and mellow wisdom which are fitted to conciliate and persuade the reader. Topics like the inspiration of Scripture are finely handled with the avoidance of all unnecessary controversy. The space given to the refutation of Premillenarian views may be taken as indicating that these have attained to more prominence in America than in Britain.

Dr. Clovis C. Chappell of Washington is one of America's popular preachers. He has issued a volume of *Sermons on Biblical Characters* (Doran; \$1.50). The sermons have a distinctly modern flavour and are full of sound teaching crisply expressed. They make no attempt to scale the heights or penetrate the depths, but they maintain a good level throughout. The treatment is often suggestive and the illustrations are apt and memorable, if occasionally melodramatic.

Mr. Bardsley Brash has written a small book

called *The Pilgrim's Way* (Epworth Press; 2s. net), because he believes that what we need to-day is the 'temper and mind of the pilgrim.' The book is Mr. Brash's account of the problems and pleasures, hindrances and helps, ideals and dreams of the pilgrim, and is an answer to the questions, 'Who am I?' and 'Why am I here?' 'Alice, amidst all the perplexing changes of Wonderland, cried out, "Who am I? Ah; that's the puzzle." It is indeed. For if we could answer that question, and also another—"Why am I here?"—we should know the meaning of life. We ask many questions, for—to use the phrase of the Elephant's child, of whom Kipling writes—we have "a 'satiating curiosity"; and yet how rarely we ask the two which are most central!' The book is full of similar happy allusions.

If any one is setting out on a course of sermons on the Old Testament characters or the like, he had better have a look at *Ancient Hebrew Stories and their Modern Interpretation* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.), by Professor Jordan of Kingston. For there he will find an admirably clear and lucid introduction of some seventy pages, giving in compact form the main results of the patient researches of modern scholarship, and thereafter a careful study of each story, the sources, the parallels, the ideas of permanent value embodied in it, and so on. But he will have to read with caution, for he will see the heads of sermons staring out at him from every page; will come on them almost too easily.

If I Miss the Sunrise, by J. H. Chambers Macaulay, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), is offered as 'a study in the reality of religion.' It is on the whole a somewhat perplexing and unsatisfactory book. The writer sets out to trace the process by which he passed from the materialism of last generation to a full faith in the God of love as revealed in Jesus Christ. There is evidence of wide reading, of competent scholarship, of unusual wealth and even exuberance of language. But the reader moves forward through a mist of words amid which he looks in vain for the sunrise of clear thinking. Better work is done when the writer comes to the exposition of the life and passion and resurrection of Jesus as the revelation of the God of love. Here the warmth of his Christian feeling finds scope, and inspires his apologetic with the glow of a fine

passion. The pages are brightened with a pleasing variety of literary allusions, and the book, if not a serious contribution to Christian thinking, is fitted to be a stimulus to Christian devotion.

Since the days when Tatian compiled his 'Diatessaron' the problem of harmonizing the four Gospels has had a fascination for many minds. Modern criticism has put the older harmonies out of date by showing that the Gospels do not supply the necessary chronological data. Still, for purposes of study and comparison, a harmony is useful and even necessary. To meet this need we have modern harmonies, in Greek or English, of the Synoptic or of all four Gospels. Of harmonies in English undoubtedly the freshest and the best is *A Harmony of the Gospels for Students of the Life of Christ*, by Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). It is a revision of the well-known harmony by Dr. Broadus, who was the first to abandon the attempt to establish a hard-and-fast chronology, and to concern himself rather with bringing out 'the inner movements of' the history, towards that long-delayed but foreseen and inevitable collision, in which, beyond all other instances, the wrath of man was made to praise God.'

In Professor Robertson's competent hands the harmony becomes a new work. Here there are no forced renderings, no special pleading. The data are given as free from bias as circumstances allow, so that students can use the book and interpret the facts according to their various theories. No effort is made to reconcile all the divergent statements of various details in the different Gospels. The differences challenge the student's interest as much as the correspondences, and are natural marks of individual work. In the appendix valuable notes are given on points of special difficulty. The tone of these discussions is impartial and eminently fair. The book should prove helpful to the student of the English New Testament.

In *The New Psychology and the Parent* (Jarrolds; 6s. net), Dr. H. Crichton Miller attempts to explain to the average parent the bearing of the discoveries of psycho-analysts on the rearing of children. That the book will have any great influence for good we do not venture to predict. Among many observations that are shrewd, suggestive, and sensible, there are some that strike us, and we

think they will strike the normal parent of normal children, as rather grotesque. The author's views, it seems to us, are distorted by his extensive experience of abnormalities.

Christmas and the Year Round, by Frank Crane, D.D. (John Lane; 6s. net), contains something over a hundred very short essays full of whimsical wit and good sense. Dr. Crane rattles on in breezy style from topic to topic, his aim being, as he says, not to build a house but to supply bricks. It is not a book to be read through, but to be dipped into for refreshment in an idle hour. Yet there is much food for thought in it, for beneath the light touch there is a serious purpose.

The Holy City: A Tragedy and Allegory in Three Acts, by Dorothy St. Cyres (Longmans; 5s. net), is a noble drama in blank verse, dealing with the ancient theme of the conflict between conscience and expediency. The heroine is a girl who is torn between the claims of home and the call of a new prophet in whom she passionately believes. It is only at the very end that 'the Master' sees as he dies the City of his faith. All his disciples have left him except the faithful Mahrah. The spirit of the poem is elevated throughout and the verse dignified and beautiful.

Baron Max von Oppell finds the search for truth the chief good in life. He would say that if truth were a bird, and he had it in his hand, he would let it go for the pleasure of pursuing it. 'Once life itself provided for, the riddle is beyond doubt the most real and earnest thing before us.' And even if we shall never solve the riddle, why should we not think of it for its charm? Thus, throughout his little book, which reflects a mystical pantheism, the writer meditates, finding in beauty, time, life, and all else an expression of a dimly perceived spirit. The book is entitled *The Charm of the Riddle* (Maclehose; 3s. 6d. net).

Generally speaking, people do not regard the Sunday School as a school in the strict sense of the word, and the churches have not advanced as a body along the lines of educational reform. This, at any rate, is the opinion of the Rev. E. F. Brayley, M.A., LL.M., Vice-Principal of Culham Training College for Schoolmasters, Oxford. 'It is stated,' he says in his introduction to *A Sunday*

School in Utopia (Macmillan ; 5s. net), 'that the Church lost half a million children during the war. If religious bodies do not regard Sunday-school work as important enough to be economically organized, scientifically and systematically psychologized, and paid for, we must not be surprised if the children refuse to take us seriously.'

He, at least, approaches the Sunday School with a due sense of its importance, and in the volume referred to he has set forth in lucid style the results of a rich experience. This is a book which should be in the hands of all 'ministers of religion,' clerical and lay. For there is nothing suggested that may not be achieved. The book is practical despite its visionary title. It gives a clear outline of modern child study; it offers helpful suggestions in the art of teaching; it embodies the results of recent psychological findings; it is full of useful hints for all who are engaged in the great work of religious education; and the gift of humour enables Mr. Brayley to soften many a shrewd blow which he aims at antiquated methods. Take the following extract from the chapter on 'The Superintendent and his Work': 'He must have a very high ideal of the Sunday School. He must resolve that the Sunday School shall be the best school, because it is God's school—best in method and apparatus. Very often he should begin with a bonfire—to burn up all the old hymn-books and the harmonium that won't play, that have been bequeathed to the Sunday School by the Church people. Therefore, he will give the clergy and churchwardens no rest. Backed up by teachers, he will be a thorn in their side until they make the Sunday School a real School.' Books like this are needed.

The second annual volume of Snowden's *Sunday School Lessons*, 1923 ('International Uniform' series) (Macmillan ; \$1.25), will appeal to those teachers who prefer the Uniform to the Graded Course. The first quarter is devoted to studies in St. Luke's Gospel; the second quarter to great men and women of the Old Testament; the third to great men and women of the New Testament; and the fourth quarter to the Missionary message of the Bible. Each lesson is carefully planned out, the whole Bible passage being quoted. Correlated material is abundantly provided by Scriptural references. In the lesson development the outstanding ethical teaching is printed in heavy black

type and suggestions for questions are given at the close of each subject. The style is expository.

Any one who wishes to see what can be said for the literal theory of verbal inspiration in face of some of its greatest difficulties will find *The Creation, Fall, and Deluge*, by Rev. A. H. Finn (Marshall ; 5s. net), of interest. It is pathetic to find such an argument presented to the world to-day, an argument that contends for the strict scientific and historical trustworthiness of the early chapters of Genesis. It is even more pathetic to reflect that there must be many for whom the Divine authority of Holy Scripture rests on such an argument.

For Soul and Body, by Harriette S. Bainbridge (Marshall ; 1s. 6d. net), is a series of talks on Spiritual Healing, very earnest and full of good counsel. The two notes always are believe, and believe with a faith that is full surrender. Then the Lord's own vigour will flow into your body. The author has had a remarkable experience of spiritual healing herself, and speaks throughout with complete confidence.

Some addresses given by the Rev. A. Douglas Brown at the Keswick Convention have been published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott with the name *Revival Addresses* (2s. 6d. net). They are earnest appeals to members of the Convention to yield themselves afresh to God, so that there may be a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit throughout the land. Mr. Brown tells of a crisis in his own life when, after twenty-five years' ministry, the Spirit of God made it clear to him that it was his duty to leave his comfortable church, and give himself to evangelistic work.

Just three years ago at Crans near Geneva—her childhood's home—Renée de Benoit died at the early age of twenty-seven. Though so young her life had been full of useful work. On the declaration of war she went as an army nurse to Lyons and remained there until her marriage, when she and her husband, Dr. Pierre de Benoit, gave themselves to mission work in India. After her death a number of her letters were collected. They breathe that spirit of longing for personal sanctification which she placed above outward activity in God's service. The letters, along with a short memoir, have now been translated into English and

have been published by Messrs. Morgan & Scott (3s. 6d. net). All profits from the sale will go to the Kanarese Evangelical Mission. The title given to the volume is *A Child of the Morning*.

In *My Moorland Patients* (Murray; 12s. net) we have an illuminating and most interesting human document written by a country doctor. It was intended by the writer to be published anonymously, but since his death, just a year ago, his friends have issued it with the author's name, the late R. W. S. Bishop. After a varied training as a medical student at Leeds, London, and Paris, he found that the 'call of the wild' in his native Yorkshire was irresistible and he took up practice in Kirkby Malzeard. When one reads this remarkably vivid narrative of fact it is with a feeling that it deals with the period of the Brontë novels. But Dr. Bishop writes of what happened so recently as just before the outbreak of the Great War. Emily Brontë herself had not a more intense love for the wild stretch of country behind Haworth village than Dr. Bishop had for the same moorland, whether in the beauty of dawn, or in the dense fog and snowdrifts of winter. And he says of the inhabitants: 'These folk, though having constantly before their eyes scenes of great beauty, are yet curiously indifferent to or unconscious of it all.' There is not a chapter in this book that does not represent most vividly the characteristics of these isolated dwellers on the moorlands, the humour, the pathos, the tragedy of their lives.

Dr. Bishop says that his moorland friends were 'very obstinate, very quarrelsome, and very irreconcilable in their quarrels.' 'They never forgave and they never forgot.' The inhabitants of one village were, however, a marked contrast to their neighbours. He found that the explanation was that a former squire had been a very saintly man, with great force of character and high ideals. He took the deepest personal interest in the moral and spiritual welfare of all the village children from their earliest years. He taught them in the Sunday School, and remembered all their birthdays. 'Those he taught so well and lovingly were now parents and grandparents, and the lapse of years and experience of life had added to their gentleness and sweet reasonableness.'

Dr. Bishop has a native's command of the Yorkshire dialect, and uses it with admirable effect.

To the Hebrews, by Lesser (Pickering & Inglis; 4s. 6d.), is a good old-fashioned exposition of the Epistle. To the writer questions of criticism do not exist. The element of humanism, which has made the Bible a new book to many, is of no account. The book contains a verse by verse commentary written in a devout and earnest spirit.

The Dramatic Instinct in Religious Education, by Thomas W. Galloway, Ph.D. (The Pilgrim Press; \$1.75), is an application to Bible teaching of the educational method of expression work. The writer believes that 'children have a natural inclination to play and act, that this inclination is good and not bad, that this impulse may be used to get the child to study the biblical stories with more purpose and emotional openness and enthusiasm than can be had in any other way.' Five specimens of Biblical dramas are given. Teachers of the young will welcome anything that will increase the interest of the children in Bible stories, and without doubt the dramatic instinct may be made a powerful instrument in religious education if it be used with wisdom and reverence. But there are obvious dangers. The mediæval mystery plays will ever remain a fearful example of the depths to which this sort of thing may fall.

Two uniform volumes of Miss Royden's addresses have been published this month by Messrs. Putnams. They are *Political Christianity* (noticed in 'Entre Nous') and *Prayer as a Force* (3s. 6d. net). Both volumes are sure of a public, for the freshness of Miss Royden's thought and the directness of her preaching are known.

An admirable little manual on *Christian Faith and Practice*, by the Rev. H. U. W. Stanton, Ph.D., is published by the R.T.S. (1s. net). It is an outline of the main features of the faith and life common to Christians, prepared chiefly for non-Christians. Dr. Stanton's long experience as a missionary, and his work for vernacular literature, have helped him in a task which was waiting to be done. It has been done well, and this little book will be useful to many at home as well as in the mission field.

The addresses which were delivered at the Westminster Convention, held in St. Martin-in-the-Fields in July 1922, have found a permanent

form in a volume called *The Christian Call and Motive* (S.P.C.K. ; 5s.). The object of the Convention was to prepare communicants for the November Westminster Mission. Eighteen addresses were delivered by the Bishops of London and Edinburgh, the Dean of St. Paul's, Father Waggett, and Mr. E. S. Woods—among others. It is good to notice that fourteen of the addresses were upon God and His character—waiting upon God, and four on the active side of service. The purpose of the Convention was for the deepening of the spiritual life, and the addresses make a strong appeal for consecrated lives.

The latest issue of 'Texts for Students' is *Selections from the Qur'an*, made and introduced by the Rev. H. U. W. Stanton, Ph.D., and published by the S.P.C.K. (1s. net). The extracts are well chosen, and arranged with excellent titles, and Dr. Stanton's introduction is admirably brief and clear. The Qur'an is probably one of the dullest books in the world, but there are great passages in it, and it has an interest of its own as the Moslem Bible. Both the interest and the greatness are enhanced by Dr. Stanton's editing.

It is not easy to make really good children's sermons. Still less easy is it to preach effectively to boys approaching the age of adolescence. The late headmaster of Ardvreck School, Crieff, Mr. W. E. Frost, possessed that gift in a superlative degree. A second series of his addresses is published under the title of *Fight the Good Fight* (S.P.C.K. ; 6s. net). To begin with, these addresses are based on texts and are full of sound scriptural teaching. There is nothing in them of the fanciful and trivial, which blights so many sermons to the young. The illustrations are drawn mainly from the field of history, particularly of the war, and they not merely illuminate the subject but often thrill the reader. They are just those stories of deathless heroism which no boy can listen to without feeling the lump rise in his throat and the quick throbbing of his heart which tells him of the glory of a noble life. To Boys' Brigade officers, Scoutmasters, and all who have in hand that most difficult of all work, the moral and religious training of boys, this book should prove a veritable gold mine.

The publications of the S.C.M. maintain their freshness. *China To-day through Chinese Eyes*

(2s. 6d. net) contains seven papers written by four eminent Chinese scholars. They deal with such subjects as China's Renaissance, the Literary Revolution in China, the Impression of Christianity made upon the Chinese people, and the Chinese Church. The papers are all of high quality and most informing. They give a real insight into that mysterious entity, the Chinese mind, and to all interested in the Christianizing of China they provide much food for thought.

Three books for Sunday-school teachers have been issued by the 'Teachers and Taught' Publishing House, London. They are *The Concise Guide* for (respectively) the Primary, Junior, and Intermediate series of lessons prepared by the British Lessons Council. The Editor of the *Guide* in each case is Ernest H. Hayes, who himself writes the notes for the Junior and Intermediate courses. These helps are extraordinarily good. They contain everything (including guidance as to methods of teaching) that a teacher could require, and they are richly illustrated. Whatever scheme a teacher has to use he will receive much assistance from these books in the art of giving a Bible lesson. The prices of the two Junior courses is 9d., and of the Senior 3s. 6d. net.

A contribution to the question of Church union is made in a beautifully printed book that comes from the University of Chicago Press. It is called *The Community Church*, and the writer is Albert Clay Zumbrunnen (\$1.50). The idea is that one Church should serve a community and should admit the representatives of all the various denominations to its membership. They would not lose their denominational tie, but would retain it in the fellowship of one actual congregation. A Church of one denomination might act as the Community Church or a Church representing a federation or denomination, or finally a Church formed by a union of denominations. The exposition of this broad scheme must be sought in the book, but as a matter of fact there are already a great many such Community Churches in the United States.

Few are so well qualified to write on Psychotherapy as Dr. W. Brown, who holds, along with other important offices, that of Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy in the University of Oxford. The fact is evidently widely recognized, for within

three months a second edition of his book, *Suggestion and Mental Analysis* (University of London Press ; 3s. 6d. net), has been called for. It is not a mere reprint, but an enlargement of the first edition. After explaining and criticizing various points in

the theory and practice of psycho-analysis, hypnosis, and suggestion, he warns us—and the warning is timely—that the psycho-therapist ought to be a sound physician, a sound psychologist, and something of a philosopher and religious man.

The Wrath of God in the Teaching of Jesus.

BY EDWARD GRUBB, M.A., LETCHWORTH.

DID our Lord teach that the ultimate Divine answer to human sin is the manifestation of Wrath? Did He reveal a God whose patience with the evil in men's hearts is limited, and who, if their unrepentance exceeds the limit He has appointed, will torment or destroy them? This is not exactly the old question of Eternal Punishment: it goes deeper. The question now asked is whether punishment itself, when all means of salvation seem to have failed, is (in the teaching of Jesus) the Divine way of finally dealing with sin.

On a superficial reading of the Gospels, the answer seems quite clear. Jesus does apparently speak repeatedly of 'outer darkness,' 'unquenchable fire,' 'wailing and gnashing of teeth,' 'the worm that dieth not,' as the portion of the finally ungodly. In the older theology this was spoken of as the 'justice' of God, which used to be contrasted with His 'mercy.' The question before us is whether the God of whom Jesus taught, and in communion with whom He lived, was thought of by Him in those terms; and whether the idea of God as Judge and Avenger can be reconciled with the conviction of His Fatherhood.

Many Christians would probably be content to answer that Fatherhood represents *one side* of the Divine nature, and that there is a sterner one. This sterner side is revealed to us in the natural law of consequence, expressed by Paul in the memorable words: 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap; he that soweth to his own flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption' (Gal 6⁷. 8). That persistent wrong-doing leads to disaster would seem to be of the essence of a rational and moral universe; were things arranged otherwise, there would be no corrective of human folly. The law of consequence is, in part, remedial: it is through finding out the results of evil that we learn to do

better: 'a burnt child dreads the fire.' Was it this law of consequence that Jesus had in mind when (as reported) He spoke of 'unquenchable fire'? The difficulty is that there is no hint, in any of the passages concerning Judgment attributed to Him, that the 'fire' is remedial and purgative—unless in the sense that fear of it will induce men to repent. It is always presented, in those passages of His recorded teaching, as God's *final* answer to human sin: not as chastisement but as retribution.

Is this reconcilable with His conception of the Divine Fatherhood? All will admit that Jesus taught that the best human fatherhood we know is a clue to the character of God (Mt 7¹¹, etc.). Even the most perfect human father, we should say, must sometimes punish his children; but, if so, he will always do it for what he believes to be their good, and not for the purpose of retribution or of matching ill-desert with pain. The question therefore is not whether Divine chastisement for man's good can be included in the conception of Fatherhood, but whether we have to set, side by side with our Lord's thought of God as Father, the other conception of God as Judge and Avenger: whether, in the mind of Jesus, God was something else as well as Father, and whether the two aspects can be reconciled.

This vitally important subject has been very ably treated by Miss Dougall and the Rev. C. W. Emmet in a book recently published, *The Lord of Thought*.¹ Their contention is, broadly, that the conception of Fatherhood covers *all* that Jesus taught of God, that the other strain of teaching is not consistent with it, and not authentically His

¹ *The Lord of Thought: A Study of the Problems which confronted Jesus Christ, and the Solution which He offered.* Student Christian Movement, 12s. 6d. net.

at all, but one that springs from Jewish eschatology. Before I had read their book, which appears to be of the very highest importance for Christian theology, my own thoughts had turned strongly in the same direction. Perhaps I may be allowed to develop them in my own way, using the book occasionally for purposes of confirmation.

Such study as I have been able to give to the New Testament writings suggests three conclusions :

(1) That Jesus was, as Matthew Arnold used to say, 'above the heads of His reporters': that the early Church took over the penal ideas of Jewish eschatology; and, with these thoughts in mind, misinterpreted certain features of its Master's teaching.

(2) That Jesus, while fully recognizing the evil consequences of sin, and solemnly warning His disciples of them, did not attribute these consequences to God, whose character was for Him pure and unmingled love; and that this constituted His gospel.¹

(3) That the ideas of Judgment suggested in the Fourth Gospel are nearer to the thoughts of Jesus than are those attributed to Him by the Synoptists, especially the first.

It is impossible in one short article to deal adequately with these conclusions; all I can do is to indicate some of the data on which they rest, and to try to indicate their practical importance. I cannot keep the three points entirely separate in this discussion.

My own knowledge of the Jewish apocalyptic writings is scanty, but their main drift is set forth by Miss Dougall in Part I. of this book with a wealth of knowledge and illustration that leaves little to be desired. She points out that while not all pious Jews of the time of Jesus believed in a coming supernatural catastrophe, they all had the same underlying conception of God and man, of law and punishment,² and that many on both sides were in serious doubt and perplexity concerning the ways of God with men. (Clear evidence of this is to be found in the Apocalypse of Ezra.) What the Apocalyptists tried to do was to assure their people, in face of persecution and distress, of the final triumph of God and righteousness; but at what a cost!

'The main burden of these books is the scarcity of righteous souls and God's implacable vengeance on the unrighteous. . . . The

Gentiles were not thought of as ruled by a different idea of God, but as merely "ungodly." Impious Jews were even worse than ungodly. Worst of all were the Gentiles who oppressed the Jews. God was not thought of as able to overcome sin and save the sinners; it was only by the destruction of all the ungodly and sinners that God and good could prevail.'

The authors rightly point out that this theory of Judgment required a rigid separation of all men into wholly bad and wholly good—a conception which passed over into Christian thought, but which is contrary to all our experience of men in this world.

It was into the midst of a people so taught that John the Baptist came with his preaching of repentance, as a refuge from the swiftly approaching wrath of God.¹ His message was mainly one of gloom and dread. Jesus contrasts with it His own message, as being one of gladness and joy (Mt 11¹⁶⁻¹⁹). Could this have been so, if He also thought of God as finally the Avenging Judge? The fact seems certain that the preaching of Jesus was felt to be indeed 'good news'; and this can only have been because it was based on a new and truer idea of God and of His purpose for men. If He really held, with the eschatologists and John the Baptist, that it was only a few who would escape the Divine wrath, could there have been in His teaching this note of joy in God?

In Luke (13¹⁻⁵), Jesus repudiates the popular notion that calamities are 'sent' by God as punishments for sin. The massacred Galileans, and the eighteen on whom the tower in Siloam fell, were not 'sinners above all.' It is true He adds, 'Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish'; but the authors are surely right in interpreting this as a national and not an individual warning. If the Jewish nation went on as it was then going, the certain issue would be revolt against Rome and inevitable destruction. This national aspect of the teaching of Jesus is, happily, receiving attention now in many quarters; and there is a growing

¹ The writers suggest (with Wellhausen) that John really spoke of his Successor as one who should baptize *with fire*; that Mark has changed this to 'the Holy Spirit'; and that Q has combined the two versions of his teaching. (See also Manson, *Christ's View of the Kingdom of God*, p. 71.) I am inclined to think that John was rather more truly a forerunner of Jesus than the authors seem to allow.

belief that His fundamental teaching about the necessity of the forgiveness of enemies has, as its primary reference, national forgiveness of the Roman oppressors. However this may be, He clearly taught that men must forgive because God forgives. He saw that God is 'kind toward the unthankful and evil' (Lk 6³⁵), and men must share God's spirit of universal love. He desired national as well as individual repentance, that His nation might take up the missionary service which the greatest of the prophets had foretold for it, and become 'a light to the Gentiles' (Is 49⁶).

But what, now, of His warnings of doom? These are the subject of very careful study by Mr. Emmet in Part III. of the book. It is shown that the bulk of these warnings of Divine punishment are in the First Gospel; and evidence is brought to prove that its author has interpreted, in accordance with his own ideas about 'Judgment,' passages which in Mark and Luke are much less eschatological in tone.¹ It is in the explanation of parables that Matthew finds the chief opportunity for these warnings, and many of these explanations should probably be attributed to him and not to Jesus. As is pointed out in the footnote below, Luke is much less 'eschatological' than Matthew. Was this because as a Gentile Christian he was not interested in eschatology, and therefore toned down the teaching of Jesus, or was he nearer to its true meaning? Mr. Emmet pleads for the second view. After careful inquiry he sums up thus:

¹ In Mark's Gospel there are (I believe) only four passages concerning the final Judgment, all of which appear also in Matthew. They are Mk 3²⁹ (=Mt 12³¹, Lk 12¹⁰); Mk 8³⁸ (=Mt 16²⁷, Lk 9²⁶); Mk 9⁴³⁻⁴⁸ (=Mt 5^{29, 30} and 18^{8, 9}, not Lk.), and Mk 12⁹ (=Mt 21⁴¹, Lk 20¹⁸). The 'little Apocalypse' in Mk 13 is, in parts at least, of doubtful authenticity, and clearly refers mainly to the destruction of Jerusalem. Besides these Marcan passages there appear to be eighteen others of a similar character in Matthew, of which seven only are paralleled in Luke. The terrible denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees, which occupies nearly the whole of Mt 23, is in Mark condensed into three verses (12³⁸⁻⁴⁰), and is much milder in tone. The lesson drawn from the withering of the fig-tree in Mk 11²⁰⁻²⁵ is not, as might have been expected, Judgment, but faith, prayer, and forgiveness. Luke has three passages referring to future punishment (in addition to 13^{3, 5}, already alluded to) which are his alone: 13⁹, 16¹⁹⁻³¹ and 19^{14, 27}. The last appear to be portions of a lost parable which has been confused with the Parable of the Pounds.

'It appears then that Luke has no particular bias against eschatology as such, but simply follows his sources. This conclusion is of the greatest importance for our whole investigation. . . . Seeing that Luke retains the eschatology of Mark and of his sources in Acts, there is no reason to suppose that he deliberately cut it out from Q. We follow him rather than Matthew as giving us the truer report of Christ's teaching where the two overlap.'

We may remember it is Luke who gives us the principle of Divine justice, that he who knew not his lord's will is to be beaten with few stripes (12^{47, 48}); and who makes Jesus, when reading from Is 61 in the synagogue at Nazareth, stop short of the words, 'and the day of vengeance of our God' (4¹⁹). In the priceless parables which he gives us from his special source, there is (except in Dives and Lazarus) almost no eschatology.

Finally, we have to reckon with the Fourth Gospel, to which in some respects the third makes an approach. I dealt with its Eschatology in an article in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (vol. xxviii. p. 308), and need only now recall that Judgment is there presented, sometimes at least, not as a future event in time, but 'as a present and perennial experience, as something inherent in the very fact that new moral truth is revealed, and as irrevocably bound up with the way a man uses the revelation. . . . The "world" is not to be destroyed but "overcome".'² If it is possible to think of the author as an actual companion of Jesus, he would seem to have caught his Master's meaning better than any one else; and, if not, it is perhaps no extravagance to believe that that meaning was revealed to him by the Spirit. In either case it is difficult to think that he had more insight into truth, and more sobriety of outlook, than Jesus Himself.

The importance of these conclusions, if they are in the direction of the truth, can hardly be exaggerated. Should they meet with general acceptance,

² In other words, the deeper teaching of the Fourth Gospel is that Judgment is not God's personal act, but is an outcome of the necessary constitution of the universe. It is not possible here to discuss this great and difficult subject; but I earnestly commend Miss Dougall's two central chapters on the teaching of Jesus concerning consequence and concerning forgiveness.

the Christian Church will gain, for the first time in its history, a consistent thought of God as love and nothing else; and it will recognize that this is due entirely to its Founder. The moral and social and international effects of such a revolution in the general conception of God are almost incalculable. As Miss Dougall says:

‘Whatever a man thinks his God is and does, he seeks to be and do, and generally succeeds. If his gods are sexually immoral, such is he, and that even in his worship. If his God is a God of war, he is truculent. If God is one among many, and jealous, unable to abide other gods, His followers are jealous of the prestige of any nation but their own, unable to abide other nations. If God is conceived as the One Absolute Reality, rational but impassible, man holds himself above human

joys and sorrows in Stoic aloofness. . . . If God’s holiness consists in the vindictive punishment of wrong, and His glory consists in the power to coerce His creature into obedience, human civilization will express itself in a penal code and will be founded on military force. . . . A penal code cannot command obedience, as the Jews discovered; but a Living Love, give it time and scope, does adapt men to the good life. Love is thus higher and more majestic than law, for it rules free spirits. It is the only power that can leave men free while yet it controls their actions.’

Jesus Christ met the evil of the world not by overwhelming it with supernatural force, but by going to the Cross. If He was really Divine, then His way of overcoming evil is God’s way; and it must be man’s way too.

Recent Foreign Theology.

A New Departure in the Investigation of the Synoptic Gospels.¹

It is difficult, in a brief review, to give an idea of the significance of this book. Professor Bultmann, whose reputation is established among the younger scholars of Germany, has here set himself to the important task of attempting to get behind the Synoptic Gospels as we have them and to analyse the process by which they reached their present form. The inquiry is one which must often have appealed to New Testament investigators, and, whatever may be thought of its results, it is at least a real advantage to be shown clearly the various difficulties involved.

Bultmann examines the material with extreme minuteness under two main headings, the ‘Tradition of the Words of Jesus’ and the ‘Tradition of Narrative Matter.’ The former division is subdivided into (a) a group which he names *Apophthegmata*, i.e. passages ‘whose point consists in a word of Jesus apprehended in a brief

framework’; (b) words of the Lord (Logia in the strict sense, prophetic and apocalyptic words, legal words and regulations for the Church, I-words, and parables). The second division embraces (a) miracle stories, and (b) historical narratives and legends. Bultmann’s standpoint is that the first Gospel writer, Mark, must have found a number of isolated traditions floating about, and he tries to show in detail how the evangelist constructed them into the form in which we have them in the Gospel. But he also analyses what he conceives to be those separate, isolated passages with the most laborious thoroughness. A glance at the register of passages from the Synoptic Gospels (for he applies a similar treatment to Matthew and Luke) reveals the astounding pains he has spent on the analysis.

It may at once be admitted that over and over again his analysis brings out most interesting and instructive results. Take, e.g., the very difficult passage, Mt 5¹⁷⁻¹⁹. Bultmann thinks that the passage goes back to the discussion between the more conservative (Palestinian) and the more liberal (Hellenistic) section of the early Christian community. ‘*μὴ νομίσητε*’ shows that v.¹⁷ arose from debate. . . . V.¹⁸ in its formulation of principles and in its antagonism to primary tradition can

¹ *Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition*. By R. Bultmann, Professor in Giessen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1921. Pp. x, 229. Price 9s.

only be a Church-formation, and v.¹⁹ cannot be a polemic against Jewish teachers of the law, but only against the Hellenists' (pp. 83, 84). Note-worthy is the elaborate representation of the fundamental form of proverbs and Logia from the O.T., and the full tables which follow of parallels in the Synoptic Gospels. The remarkable kinship is unmistakable. But from beginning to end the analysis reveals an extraordinary subjectivity. Typical of the author's position is the statement, 'in general the words have created the situation, not vice versa.' The vast majority of the situations commented on are described as 'ideal,' i.e. the product of the earliest community. Now most students of the Gospels would be willing to admit that the dominant Messianic convictions of the early Church must often have coloured the accounts of events given in the Gospels. But Bultmann seems to set no bounds to his critical incredulity. He goes the length of regarding the story of the centurion of Capernaum (Mt 8⁵⁻¹³|| Lk 7¹⁻¹⁰) as a variant of that of the Syrophenician woman (Mt 7²⁴⁻³¹ and parallels). He shows the utmost scepticism as to all kinds of details. Thus, e.g., the story of the call of the first disciples, placed at the Lake of Galilee, probably takes this form from the metaphor used by Jesus when He names them 'fishers of men.' The account of the call of Levi has no historical value: 'the only interest felt by the tradition was that a tax-collector was summoned from his occupation to follow Jesus: *where* Levi was tax-collector, we do not hear' (p. 35). This meticulousness is surely artificial.

What traditions in the world could submit to such a process? One cannot help feeling that the author ought to have laid down certain criteria for the testing of the material. Because he has not, his procedure is reduced largely to guess-work.

With justice Bultmann calls attention to the activity of the Church in the *redaction* of the material, 'a redaction which essentially, but by no means only, belongs to the period when it took shape in writing' (p. 89). He shows most instructively how the grouping of passages necessitated such redaction, pointing out the actual words and phrases used by the evangelists to accomplish their purpose. Indeed, we get a very vivid picture of the process of composition on pp. 200-204.

The volume closes with an exceedingly interesting characterization of the three Synoptic Gospels, in which the author gives it as his opinion that Mark used no source which could be called a Gospel, that Matthew adheres to Mark's fundamental picture of the life of Jesus, that Luke's main deviation is the large section beginning with chap. 9⁵¹, which he introduced both because he felt the need of illuminating Jesus' last journey to Jerusalem more clearly than Mark had done, and because he found in this an opportunity of recording all sorts of passages which had no particular situation.

We are more than ever convinced of the far-reaching problems which confront the investigator who enters the fascinating realm of the traditions behind the Synoptic Gospels.

H. A. A. KENNEDY.

Edinburgh.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Blasting without Powder.¹

'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.'—Ph 4¹³.

You know about the Roman Wall? You'll find it in the very first pages of your history book. No! no! before Alfred. No, further back than Mercia and all the other six of them, away back at the first three or four pages, it's there you'll come on the great wall built to keep out the wild

¹ By the Rev. Arthur J. Gossip.

northern clans and tribes ever so long ago, yet built so splendidly and solidly that there are bits of it there still, and you can follow it almost from sea to sea, and come upon the camps where the old battalions had their quarters, and see the ruts in the pavements made by the Roman chariots, and the baths where the great people used to bathe, and many another thing. I've never seen it, but I understand that there is a deep trench that runs along for many miles on one side of the wall; and at one place this trench comes up against a huge mass of rock, one of the very hardest kinds of rock,

that lies there full in its way. This must be the end, you and I would have said. For how can they get through? They had no instruments and machinery, as have the engineers to-day; no dynamite or blasting powder. They can't do it, we would have said. And yet they did. And how? Well, I'm told that they bored round holes into the rock, one here, one a foot or two further on, a long line of them: and that they plugged them with wood, and then poured water on the wood; and that made it swell, and when the wood in all the holes pressed out together all at once it burst the rock and split it, and allowed the trench to run right through.

And that is the way for you and me to manage to get through our difficulties. Take lessons, take those dreadful verbs, Latin or French or Greek. You feel you will never get them up. The other night you had a dozen of them and you worked hard. But at school you jumbled them all up, *cado* and *cædo* and *cedo*; and you are only at it as yet, and there are pages and pages still to come. You'll never manage. Yes, you will. Even though you have no dynamite to blow it all to bits; even though you aren't clever, but slow and a bit dull and dreadfully forgetful, bore your small hole every night. It will seem to make no difference in the mile or so of solid rock. Yet bore one on Monday, and another on Tuesday, and a third on Wednesday, and a fourth on Thursday, and another on Friday, and night by night one more, and by and by the rock will crack right through.

And so with other things—sulks, ill-nature, all the rest of them. There's not one you can't master. There is nothing need pull you up. You think you can't break down these things; so did Paul. He had worked hard, had picked and dug, and picked and dug, and had nothing to show for it except his sore shoulders and tired arms. The sulks and the rest were not worn away one bit. But he came on a great Engineer called Jesus Christ, and He showed him how to manage.

These soldiers must have thought the trench would go no further. Ah, but, said their engineer, we'll manage, rock or no rock, and they did—little by little, bit by bit, one small hole and then another. And you must not think that you can't conquer anything. Alone you couldn't do it. But our wise Engineer will help us, if we do our part. You're just a hot, peppery, peevish little chap. But you

needn't remain that. Day by day do your best to conquer it; meet this temptation in the playground when you get hacked, and then this one in bed when you're sleepy and you ought to rise, and then this one when you can't be bothered doing lessons, and then the next, just one temptation at a time. Stand up to it, conquer it, bore this small round hole in the rock, and then another, and another, and one more. And by and by it will split right across, and you will be through.

God's Marks.

'His name shall be in their foreheads.'—Rev 22⁴.

The Hindu lives a great deal in the invisible world; that is to say, he withdraws himself from this, just as, I dare say, your mother sometimes does—with a difference of course. You speak to her at times, and she does not answer at once: you speak again and she seems to wake up. She probably just says, 'I was thinking.' It would be much more difficult to bring the Hindu back to earth. Even if you succeeded in doing it, you would not be able to persuade him to tell you anything about where he had been. I believe he thinks that his pet animals are sharers of the rewards that come to people for having done good deeds. And you would not understand him even if he did tell you. Hindus think so differently from us. To the Hindu the cow is a deity, and there are other animals that he imagines are on a higher plane than himself.

If you happened to pay a visit to India, and were admitted to an Indian house, you would see animals of all kinds running about everywhere. Amongst them would probably be a pretty little tame squirrel having grey fur marked with dark brown stripes. The Indian has a great reverence for this squirrel. There is a beautiful Indian story that tells how the brown stripes came to be on its back. It runs thus: The god Ram wanted to build a bridge between India and Ceylon, and the larger animals were all eager to have a share in so important an undertaking and set to work, the elephants bringing down large pieces of rock, and the oxen and buffaloes and donkeys bearing their several burdens. The little squirrels saw all this, and were determined to do their bit, so they took counsel together as to what their share should be, and thought of a plan. They went down to the sea and bathed, and then rubbed them-

selves in the sand, which stuck to their wet fur. After this they sunned themselves till the sand was dry, and then shook it all off into a heap. They repeated this time after time and collected quite a large pile of sand, and when the time came for the bridge to be built, the sand was all ready for the mortar. The monkeys went to tell the god Ram of the work of the little squirrels, and Ram was so greatly pleased that he sent for the squirrels and stroked them in commendation; and the Hindus say that the stripes are the marks of the god Ram's fingers.

You probably think it is rather a stupid story. That is a mistake, for don't we in this country often hear one with the same idea in it, only ours is very much finer? Picture to yourselves those graceful creatures dancing about and doing their piece of helpful work entirely unconscious of doing anything specially good. The god Ram saw and set his mark upon them.

Our Scouts and the boys of the Brigade are banded together in their effort to be truly manly—to serve God and the King, and to try to do some kind action every day, especially to those weaker than themselves. It was a bit hard at first, was it not? You had to remember every time you performed an act of courtesy or kindness. You learned to pray for help to get rid of your selfishness and meanness! You had to plant good qualities in their place. Now your kind action is performed as a matter of course.

And the marks are placed upon many lads. People say, 'I know a *Scout* when I see him; he has a certain look about him.' 'The Scouts and Brigade boys are growing up to make the world better—to help to build the bridge between earth and heaven.'

An eminent London photographer wrote an article for a learned paper. In it he said that 'one of the best evidences for religion is the type of face it produces.' 'His name shall be in their foreheads.' A little girl was one day reading the Bible, and she came upon those words. 'I don't understand that,' she said to her grandfather. 'Who will write the name of Jesus on their foreheads?' 'Why, they write it themselves, of course.' 'Write it *themselves*, grandfather! But how?' 'Why, Margery, we are every day writing the name of our Master on our foreheads. Some people make a mistake and serve sin, and it stamps its seal upon their faces. Some serve care, and care brands

their foreheads with deep wrinkles. But those who love Jesus Christ and walk with Him, and do His will, write the name of their Master on their foreheads. They cannot help it.' Margery looked at her grandfather. She noticed how his grey hair was like a crown of glory. She noticed more than that; she looked into his eyes. He had a beautiful face. The problem of the name in the forehead was solved for her. She said softly and reverently 'I think I understand, grandfather.'

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Awesomeness of Forgiveness.

'But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.'—Ps 130⁴.

1. It is good hearing that there is *forgiveness with God*. For that fact of God meets the need of man which man most widely recognizes, whether he claims and rests in the forgiveness that is offered or no.

Lips cry, 'God be merciful,'
That ne'er cried, 'God be praised.'

'There is forgiveness with God.'

(1) How *simple* the word is: every one can understand it. Every one knows what is meant when an earthly father forgives his child. He answers him that he will no longer remember his sins, will not impute the evil experienced, and will not punish him. He will deal with the child as if he had done no harm.

(2) How *sure* the word is. Every one may believe it. Jesus came from heaven to obtain an atonement for us. His blood is the pledge of it. Thousands of the greatest sinners can support the truth of the cry: 'With God there is forgiveness.'

(3) How *powerful* the word is. It is living; it will cause hope to rise in your soul. It will inspire you with new thoughts about God; it will instil into you confidence and boldness before Him. Lay up this word in your heart, give it a place there, think over it, and say in spoken words before your God: 'Lord, with thee there is forgiveness.' Insensibly you will get up to saying 'With Thee there is forgiveness *also for me*.'¹

2. There is forgiveness with thee, *that thou*

¹ A. Murray, *Why do you not Believe?* p. 30.

‘*ye shall be feared.*’ That is an unexpected conclusion. Forgiven in order to fear. Does it not come in a poor and pitiful way of stating the issues of God’s mercy? Should it not rather be, forgiven, therefore hoping, loving, rejoicing? But the Calvinist is not mistaken. ‘That thou mayest be feared’ is not unintelligible, as has been avowed. It shows indeed deep psychological insight. What is this fear? It is not dread. It is not the feeling which makes a man flee in the hour of danger. It is the emotion of reverent awe. It is the kind of fear which to a greater or less extent has formed part of the experience of every life, the fear of the unknown; which is common to the child crying in the dark, and the saint stretched on his death-bed, and is felt whenever we allow our minds to wander over unexplored regions, whether of mere anticipation, or of thought, speculation, and faith.

God forgives in order that men may fear. And forgiveness is meaningless, unless sin be a reality. God has marked and does mark what is done amiss, and the fear of God begins at a point rather back than the forgiveness which He offers: it begins, or should begin, with the thought of the sin for which forgiveness is needed. We can abide the wrath of God only because He forgives: yet how small is the number of those who remember and fear that wrath, when sin is committed, before the thought of forgiveness or of the need for it has crossed their minds. This attribute of God meets with scant acceptance by some. But it is worth while to inquire whether—in some systems of religion—there remain any attributes of God at all. The doctrine of God’s immanence be isolated from that of His transcendence, and if that isolation is pressed to the extent to which some would carry it, the Personality of God disappears, and there is no place whatever for a Supreme Moral Power in the Universe. It is not only the wrath of God, but also His Power, His Holiness, His Love—

His attributes—which are in danger of being lost in a cloud of words and phrases to-day. And could it not have helped *Mr. Britling* to have sat under the Gifford Lecturer who, at the beginning of his course, laid down this clear proposition? When I speak of God, I mean something other than an Identity wherein all differences vanish, a Unity which includes but does not transcend the differences which it somehow holds in solution. We mean a God Whom men can love, a God to Whom men can pray, Who takes sides, Who has purposes

and preferences, Whose attributes, howsoever conceived, leave unimpaired the possibility of a personal relation between Himself and those whom He has created.’¹

But if it be granted that we are not degrading God, when we attempt in human language to describe His Nature, the question will still remain whether a God of Love can also be a God of Wrath. Certainly, if anger be merely the outcome of a fitful ill-temper, then we should indeed be doing God great dishonour if we were to associate any such attribute with His character. But if it be the expression of a righteous disapproval (as we find it manifested in the life of our Blessed Lord), then it is hard to see how a loving and a Holy God can be true to His Nature if He has never felt that disapproval, when He sees the havoc wrought in the world which He made so fair.

But it is not the fear before forgiveness that the text speaks of. It is the fear after forgiveness. That God can give us the sense of guilt, of alienation, when we have sinned is something for which we should never cease to thank Him. That He can as truly remove that sense of guilt, that He can forgive us again and again, should cause us to feel not only thanksgiving, but fear.

For surely before forgiving love a reverent awe is bound to rise in the minds of incomplete and sinful men, who still desire greatness of soul at its highest. It is an emotion which has a double element in it. It contains (1) a simple appreciation of splendour as splendour: and (2) a wistful appreciation of another’s reach and grasp as far exceeding ours. Always in face of goodness a complex emotion of that kind must arise in our hearts, if we desire goodness at all.

And further, when we have come to know the means by which it pleased God to make forgiveness possible for us, still more shall we realize the need of Holy Fear. We cannot picture, in all its terrible details, the scene of the Crucifixion, but we know the effect it had upon some of those who stood by. They ‘feared greatly,’ and one of them said, ‘Truly this was the Son of God.’ And because He died that we might be forgiven, the pardon which is bestowed upon us can never be separated, in our minds, from that scene. The Hand that is raised to bestow the Blessing of Forgiveness is a pierced Hand. We cannot dissociate the joy of Absolution from the fearfulness of Calvary. The warning of

¹ A. J. Balfour, *Theism and Humanism*, 21.

St. Peter is surely clear on this point: 'Pass the time of your sojourning here in fear; forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious Blood of Christ.'¹

Forgiveness first, godly fear second, and thirdly a consecrated will, for the issue of godly fear is a life of consecrated will.

SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY.

Vocation.

'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?'—Ac 9⁶.

There is no such thing as salvation except as a man is saved from a self-regarding point of view to another-regarding attitude and point of view. In a conversation in the presence of Mazzini the subject of goodness was being discussed, and some one in his hearing talked about a mutual friend of theirs as being religious and good. Mazzini said: 'Whenever I hear a man called good, I ask, "Who, then, has he saved?"' An artist was painting a picture once in his studio, and the picture was a picture of a poor woman out in the night, thinly clad, tossed by the tempest and hard driven, hugging a little baby to her breast. He thought as he painted, and as he painted he suddenly flung down his brush and said, 'God help me; why don't I, instead of painting pictures of lost people, go and help them myself?' That man was as good as his word. He did go and help them himself. He set out for Africa as soon as he could, because he discovered that, as far as he could see, the most needy people in the world at that time were to be found in that continent, and for the last twenty-five years of his life Alfred Tucker (for that was his name) was a missionary in Uganda.

What are we going to do? We must share our life. Every man who means to share will each morning take a fresh look at his ideal not to be ministered unto but to minister, to be last of all and servant of all—for it is more blessed to give than to receive—and he will look at his Master too to take in a new stock of hope and courage, and then he will plunge recklessly and cheerily into a day of service. In the give and take of family life he will do plenty of giving. Then in all the traffic of common intercourse in the street, in the bus, in the shop, office, workroom, at the playing-fields, it will be for such a man a never-ending delight, like a secret game played with him-

self, to devise all sorts of ways in which to carry out his sharing scheme.

1. *Share it in material and external things* to begin with. All men need life, physical and spiritual, the material environment, the material setting as well as the thing itself which we call life. Millions in the world are going short of it, and there is no ghost of a chance of most people in the world having even an opportunity to get life, using the word in its largest sense, unless and until those who have a closer access to it are more ready to share. Do you not think that if we meant business by being followers of Jesus Christ it would be for us all a point of honour not to have more than our fair share of the good things in this world?

The question is beset with difficulties. And yet when all has been said and done and every qualification has been made, when there are so many millions of people so desperately in need of even the bare necessities of life, cannot we get a bit closer to the ideal of not more than a fair share? 'We are polite enough,' it has been said, 'to surrender our seat in a bus to another weaker person, but rarely our seat in the saddle of wealth and privilege. Convention gives us each our place and advantage, and we have tried to argue that God meant us each to keep our seats in the world's bus, trusting that He would make other people's standing and pushing congenial to them. We have abandoned the ideal of loving our neighbour as ourselves, covering ourselves forsooth with the theological defence of caring more for our brother's soul than his body. But you remember what the Master said about the people of grace, and the people who were withheld from grace: 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'

2. There is more to do than that. What we as Christians have got to share most of all is *the very quality and stuff of which the best in our life is made up*. We will do that sharing whether we will or no. The saint has been defined as one who makes it easier for other people to believe in God. God gives Himself to people through people, and unquestionably there are persons who are waiting to get something of God through us.

In the main the Church is not doing its job in giving Jesus Christ to the hungry folk. And the mischief lies in our own lives, because men cannot see Christ in them. God forgive us that right within the Church there is so much coldness about Jesus

¹ F. A. Iremonger, *Before the Morning Watch*, 75.

Christ. We as Christians are called not to be cold about Christ, but to catch from Him a burning fire, the kind of passion that can set a light to all the fuel that is in the hearts of men and women around us. We can, if we will, get so close to Him, and live so close to Him, and let Him set our heart on fire, that men shall see in us something which will lead them to Jesus Christ. It will mean a clearing out of a lot of rubbish; it will mean making the door open that He may come clean in; it will mean not counting the cost, if the spirit of Christ is going to make His home in our personality. If we are prepared, not counting the cost, to say the thing shall be done, then God will be able to use us.¹

SEXAGESIMA SUNDAY.

Teacher, Saviour, Friend.

Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever.—He 13⁸ (R.V.).

The Hebrew Christians to whom these words were addressed had hung upon the messages of men who watched for their souls; the living example, also, of their leaders had been a constant incentive to self-doing, and the faith which shone in their whole life, and breathed through all their words, had been an inspiration. Now they were bereft. Yet not bereft; for He in whom they had thus been taught to believe, who was the end and aim of those faithful ministrations, was the same—'the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever.'

Though since then the weary ages have rolled away, His years have not failed. Though all things are in ceaseless fluctuation and change, He abides. Yesterday and to-day, to-day and henceforth, He is the abiding Teacher, Saviour, Friend.

1. First, Jesus Christ is our *Teacher*. It is natural to the human mind to hunger for the truth. This desire is strong or weak, in proportion to the general alertness of the mind, or its lassitude; and in proportion as the intellectual faculties are not kept in abeyance by the indulging of appetite, or made merely tributary to selfish ends, whether of pain or of pleasure. In the case of those who are more serious and earnest, in whom conscience holds its proper place, and speaks with its full force, this general desire to know becomes more especially a craving to know what is right, to learn the truth of duty. And where the soul is touched to yet finer

issues by the Spirit of God, this longing becomes still more defined and intensely personal: 'that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death; if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead' (Ph 3^{10, 11}).

This need of the human mind is fully met by Jesus Christ. 'Jesus went about . . . teaching': so does St. Matthew describe our Lord's opening ministry (4²³). 'Seeing the multitudes, he went up into the mountain: and he opened his mouth, and taught them' (5¹). But did not such work fill all the busy days? 'The Teacher' was perhaps His most familiar designation. Moreover, the truths that He taught were truths of duty. With a sure hand, He delineated the great principles of conduct and character, as they have never else been made known among men. Over the portals of the Kingdom of Heaven He inscribed the Beatitudes, sparkling as with all manner of precious stones; and He pointed the people to the straitened way of righteousness, as 'the way that leadeth into life.' But, in His teaching, the way of righteousness was ever the way of faith. He taught men that only by trusting and loving God could they become truly good. Thus He met the spiritual hunger of the mind by speaking of the Kingdom of God. At last, gathering up into one weighty word all this significance of His ministry, and expressing besides the essential significance of Himself, as being One whom most of all it concerned men to know, He said, 'I am the truth.'

'Christ,' says Mr. Clutton-Brock, 'was not a philosopher; if you speak of His teaching you seem to do Him a wrong, as if you spoke of the teaching of Mozart. He does not prove to us, He reveals; and what we say is—not even, That is true, but—That is what I wish to be.'²

2. Again, Jesus Christ is our *Saviour*. Deeper and more fundamental than the need of knowledge is the need of salvation. If the mind craves for truth, so does the conscience, either clamorously or mutely, cry for appeasement and cleansing. Indeed, in proportion as we learn the law of righteousness, do we learn how far we have gone astray from the way of God's will, and how grievously we have broken His commands. The more clearly we discern the beauty of holiness, and the sacredness of God's claims upon our trust and love, the

¹ E. S. Woods, in *The Christian Call and Motive*, 56.

² *Studies in Christianity*, 69.

more are we convicted of our alienation from God by an evil heart of unbelief. Nor is the evil an evil which it is within our own power to remedy. We cannot, by ever so little, undo the guilt of the past; nor can we loose ourselves from the present bondage of the soul to sin's tyrannous power. Our utmost struggling does but bring home to us the fact that we are hopelessly undone and lost. We need a Divine salvation.

This need, above all, is met by Jesus Christ. More important than the teaching was the preaching of Jesus Christ, and He preached Himself as the Saviour. Listen to His manifesto as made known to His fellow-townsmen of Nazareth. 'He opened the book, and found the place where it was written,

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,
Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to
the poor:
He hath sent me to proclaim release to the
captives,
And recovering of sight to the blind,
To set at liberty them that are bruised,
To proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. . . .

And he began to say unto them, To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears' (Lk 4¹⁷⁻²¹). His wonderful works among the people were an object-lesson of His power to save. He came among them everywhere as the Healer and Helper, and they felt that a new power of God was in their midst, laying itself alongside their sin and misery, bringing truest sympathy and strong salvation. Let them be ever so outcast and abandoned, He brought to their despair so great a hope, and did so melt them into contrite shame by the Divine pity and purity of His love, that they fell weeping at His feet, only to hear Him say, 'Thy sins are forgiven . . . thy faith hath saved thee' (Lk 7^{48, 50}). And He published it abroad, as the justification of all His manner of life, 'For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost' (19¹⁰). Even as to the disciples at last, expressing again in one word the whole meaning of His redeeming grace, and anticipating the great reconciliation of the Cross, He said, 'I am the way'—the way by which guilty, estranged, polluted sinners may come home to God.

When Phillips Brooks was about to preach in Westminster Abbey, Dean Stanley asked him what

he was going to preach about. His reply was, 'I have but one subject—the Divine life of the Saviour of men.'¹

3. Once more, Jesus Christ is our *Friend*. It is natural to the heart of man to hunger for love. We are full of longings that can find rest only in fellowship and affection. Our souls are not self-sufficing or self-satisfying. We need one another, and this not merely in the sense that we need one another's help: we need the revelation of heart to heart, the converse of soul with soul. But, having intercourse with one another, we still crave for deeper, tenderer, more intimate fellowship. And even when we have found our nearest and most confidential friendships, we crave for yet fuller satisfaction than the heart can find in the best and truest human friendships and affections—even for the friendship of the Infinite, for fellowship with God.

This Divine satisfaction Jesus brings to men. He came to woo them, and to win them. It was this yearning affection for the people that commended the grace of God to their hearts. And in proportion as they were receptive of His love, He loved them with a love ever fuller and more intimate. 'Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus' (Jn 11⁵); 'the disciple whom Jesus loved' (21²⁰): so intensely did His heart's affection concentrate itself on those who were able to receive it! And the great assurance to which all His teaching and all His saving grace led the way, and which He bequeathed to the disciples as their precious possession for ever, was the word uttered on that ever to be remembered last night, in the Upper Room, 'Ye are my friends.' Was it not also in reference to this same making known of His uttermost love, a love sealed in sacrificial death, but triumphing over sin and death, that He said, 'I am the life'?²

The friendship of Jesus Christ seems to have been to Thomas à Kempis something more than His *love*. By it he means the love of Christ in daily companionship and intimate intercourse: 'When Jesus is present, all is well, and no labour seems difficult. When He is absent, the least difficulty is found to be insupportable. When Jesus is silent, all comfort withers away; but the moment He speaks again, though but a single word, the soul

¹ J. Gregory, *Phillips Brooks*, 129.

² T. F. Lockyer, *Seeking a Country*, 160.

ises from her distress, and feels her comfort revive in greater power.'

I know Thee, Saviour, who Thou art,
Jesus, the feeble sinner's Friend ;
Nor wilt Thou with the night depart,
But stay and love me to the end :
Thy mercies never shall remove ;
Thy nature and Thy name is Love.

QUINQUAGESIMA SUNDAY.

Walk in Love.

'Walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us.'—Eph 5².

The word 'walk' is used three times in this chapter. Each time we are told to walk in a particular way. In the fifteenth verse we are told to walk 'circumspectly.' In the eighth verse we are told to walk as 'children of light.' And in this verse we are encouraged to 'walk in love.' 'Walking' is a common expression in the Bible for our way of living, our conduct. It is a graphic expression, for all life is movement, and the question for us is, How are we moving? How are we walking?

1. We must walk circumspectly. The word translated circumspectly means, literally, 'accurately'—it means paying attention to little things. A business a merchant, to be successful, must attend to the details of business. It is the same all through life. If a man is to get on in any trade or profession he must not consider the little things beneath his notice.

And it is the same in the Christian life. How many Christians are spoken of with a 'but'! He is a good sort of man, 'but' he drives a very hard bargain. But when the Apostle exhorted to walk 'accurately,' the fault he probably referred to was a lack of strict truthfulness. He does not refer to our lying. He is thinking rather of a habit of exaggeration. See, then, he says, that ye walk accurately.

2. But he also tells us that we should walk as children of light. That is a greater thing than walking circumspectly. It means knowing where we are going. To 'walk in darkness' is the ordinary expression in the Bible for being blind to the great issues in life. Many of those who walk circumspectly, paying attention to all the little details of business, are all the time walking in darkness, for they are walking according to the light of this world. To walk in the light is to live according

to the mind of Christ. 'I am the light of the world,' He said, 'he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

3. Then there is the walking of our text—walk in love. That goes deeper still. It gives the motive of all life, and it states the atmosphere in which all our life is to be carried on. If we walk in love we are walking in the light, and we shall be able to walk circumspectly. So the Apostle gives us the strongest possible encouragement to walk in love, for he knows, and we know, that everything depends upon it. 'Walk in love,' he says, 'even as Christ loved you and gave himself for you.'

How did Christ love? He did not confine His love to His own family. He commanded His followers to love their enemies. He Himself did what He commanded them to do. Even when He hung upon the Cross and heard the horrible cry of a multitude, 'Crucify him, crucify him,' He said, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.'

What is the measure of this love of Christ's? 'He gave himself for us,' says Paul. The words are simple, but they carry a tremendous meaning. They mean that Christ came into the world for the very purpose of bringing us back to God, and He knew that the only way of doing that was to give Himself for us. He lived for us, and He died for us. Up to the very end of Christ's life His disciples still regarded each other as rivals. But when He died all that completely changed. Peter *did* love John then, and Philip loved Bartholomew, for now the very spirit of Christ entered into them.

The disciples knew that He had given Himself for them—an offering and a sacrifice to God. Why does Paul add the words 'an offering and a sacrifice'? He is using language which was familiar to his readers. They brought offerings and they also brought sacrifices to the temple. The purpose of the offerings was to thank God for His goodness in bestowing the blessings of life. A few sheaves of corn were offered by way of thanking God for the harvest. It was a kind of worship; it was the expression of their daily obedience and thankfulness. Christ gave Himself as such an offering to God. He offered His life. Day by day He expressed His obedience to the Father's will in the acts of love which He did—He healed the sick; He preached the gospel to the poor.

The sacrifice was a more costly thing than the daily offering. It meant death. The offering was

a tribute of each day's devotion ; the sacrifice was the act of that high hour when what is dearer than life may have to be laid down. When we follow the life of Jesus from the cradle in Bethlehem through all the years in Nazareth, and the ministry in Galilee, and Samaria, and Judea, we understand the making of the offering to God. But when we come to Calvary and look up into the face of Christ we understand the sacrifice.

So we all come to the hour when we must give up some hope ; refuse some earthly advancement ; take up some burden which will make our steps heavy and slow to the end ; accept our cross not merely with resignation but, if possible, also with joy. No sacrifice is ever made which is not the sacrifice of love.

We have an illustration of that in the story of Captain Scott's last expedition to the Antarctic. The little band were making their way back across the trackless fields of snow. Their food was scanty. Their dogs were famishing. One of the company whose record was one of exceptional bravery and tenderness felt that he could no longer bear his share in the common task. He would only be a burden to the others. His companions roused him to continue. For a few miles more he struggled on. Then the end came. As Mr. Turley says in 'The Voyages of Captain Scott': 'He slept through the night before last, hoping not to wake ; but he woke in the morning—yesterday. It was blowing a blizzard. He said, "I am just going outside and may be some time." He went out into the blizzard, and we have not seen him since. . . . We knew that poor Oates was walking to his death.' That is love that thinks not of itself, that cares only for others in its hour of sacrifice.

Can we follow Christ in sacrifice ? Can we offer ourselves a sacrifice to God ? We can certainly make an offering to God. By daily acts of kindness we can express our thankfulness to Him for the daily gifts of His love. But we can also make our sacrifice to God. We can offer ourselves to Him. Not our work only, not our words, but ourselves. And the way to offer ourselves to God, the only acceptable way, is simply to love Him. He prefers the love of the heart to all the deeds of the hand. We ought certainly to say, as Paul himself said, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do ?' but first of all we must say, 'Lord, *have* me, *take* me, *receive* me in Christ Jesus. As Thou has given Thyself for me, I give myself to Thee.' It is

only then that we are able to walk in love as Christ loved us.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Temptation.

'And straightway the Spirit driveth him forth into the wilderness. And he was in the wilderness forty days tempted of Satan.'—Mk 1¹². 13 (R.V.).

1. *The inevitableness of temptation.*—The Spirit, who only just previously found its symbol in the form of a dove, now reveals powers of stern compulsion and 'straightway' drives Him into the wilderness. What a startling change for our Lord Jesus Christ, from the rapture in the waters of Jordan to the solitude and the duel of the desert ! What a converging of the supreme forces of good and evil round the lonely figure of Him who has come to fulfil all righteousness on our behalf ! The Divine Spirit urges Him out and on to the scene of temptation ; and there the wicked spirit assails Him with the subtle craft and the tremendous appeal of temptation itself.

Note that it was the dove Spirit that drove Him into the wilderness. It was not the impulsion of an alien power. It was not the flaming sword of the enemy which drove the Nazarene away from Jordan's green and quiet banks. It was the great Lover who led the Beloved from the feast to the fight. Jordan and wilderness are both parts of the same Divine plan.

Jordan and wilderness ! What would life be like if it were all Jordan, with open heavens and descending doves and voices of exquisite love ? Suppose we never had a nut to crack, suppose all the nuts came to us as shelled kernels, the hard encasements having been broken by other hands. Suppose we had no problems. Suppose it was all Jordan with never a touch of the wilderness. How then ?

2. *The nature of temptation.*—To Jesus, at the hour of His baptism in Jordan, there came the definite revelation that He had been chosen as God's Messiah. In this high mood He hurried into the wilderness and there met Satan ; and we conclude that the whole assault of Satan, its inmost significance, was to seduce Jesus from that high mood to lower, somehow, the lights within His soul. Every man who knows anything about the soul knows that every exalted mood, every high sense of life, of its sacredness and responsibility, meet

the devil next moment. So it was with Jesus, who was tempted in all things just as we are—but without sin.

Though we always speak of the first, and second, and third temptation, there was really but one, just as, with ourselves, in every deep experience, there is *one* thing that is troubling us, *one* thing that is haunting us. So here, Satan chose three different methods, but he had but one object.

(1) *The temptation to a low view of Himself.*—Observe the manner of the first assault. 'If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.' 'If thou be the Son of God.' It was an attempt to raise a question in the soul of Jesus. Satan tried to break the spring of action in our Lord's soul by hinting a doubt. Satan is above all else the seducer, the spirit who slays ideals, who kills enthusiasms in human souls, he is the denier, as God is the Affirmer, within all souls.

What is the doubt he hinted here? It is as though he had said: 'It is well to have high feelings, and the sense of a Divine mission in life, but'—this was the first assault, and every assault on a man's personal ideals begins with that word 'but'—'but it may be, you are deceiving yourself. It may not be God who is inspiring you, who is calling you. You may be mistaken. In any case, are you quite sure? You can soon satisfy yourself.' 'You are hungry. Here are stones. See if they will turn into bread at your word.' But Jesus silenced him and repelled him there. For had He yielded, had He agreed that it was quite fair for one who believes in God to demand at every step some visible sign that God is with him—He would have set what is seen above what is unseen, the outward above the inward, and would have enthroned faith from the soul. For the very quality of faith lies here—that a man shall be obedient to its call, shall trust to his own private inspirations, shall believe they come from God, and shall go forward just as they lead, though circumstances remain hostile and God gives no sign.

Is not this the method of Satan with us still? For the first time we see what God would have us be or do. And with a new light in our eyes, we set out upon our new behaviour. The glow of the experience itself carries us for a certain distance, and then—we meet our Satan. He may be in the form of some friend whom we have not seen for a time, and who does not know what has been happen-

ing within us of late. He speaks to us in the old way, he looks at life in our hearing as we used to look at it together. A voice begins to attack us from within. 'Do you not see,' it says, 'that you were setting yourself too high a task. You see how the glow of those fine feelings of yours has already died. If God ever was behind those feelings—which I think you may now question—He has certainly forsaken you now!' He goes on: 'Remember you are only a man, with the appetites, with the weaknesses of a man. Why did God give you these appetites if He did not mean you to yield to them?'

(2) *Temptation to a low view of others.*—Having failed to seduce Jesus by raising doubts in His mind regarding His own commission and high sense of life; having failed to lead Jesus to take a low and cynical view of Himself, the Devil proceeded to suggest to Him a low and cynical view of other men, of the Jewish nation, and of mankind.

It is as though he had said: 'Granted, then, that you are the Son of God, granted that these high emotions of yours are the very breathings of God, what then? Who are they for whom you are going to give up your life? Why should you take the high road, the sublime road, the way of spirituality and of suffering? You can get them on lower terms. Come to terms with men. Fall in with their own worldly ideas. Here are the Jews, for example; they want a Messiah of a certain kind—one who will be their King and free them from Rome. Even at this moment Jews are praying in the courts of the Temple for the Messiah to come down from heaven. Get you, then, to the pinnacle of the Temple; fall down amongst them. They will say that you fell from heaven. They will proclaim you King. You will be supreme in one day and without a moment's pain. Nay, for that matter, lower your demands of men; and if you have the power of God with you, you may have the whole world at your feet—once more without a moment's pain. They have all their price—a small one. Lower your terms, your demand; promise them just what they want—and the world is yours.'¹

3. *The result of temptation.*—What would life be without temptation? Suppose life demanded no vigilance and no quest and no resistance. Well, then, most assuredly there would be no moral muscle, no heroic fibre, no spiritual grandeur.

In one of the greatest books of the Renaissance,

¹ J. A. Hutton, *Our Only Safeguard*, 148.

although its greatness is not spiritual—in the autobiography of Benvenuto Cellini—there is a moving and exhilarating account of the casting of his masterpiece, the bronze statue of Perseus which fronts the piazza at Florence. How the wood was gathered from the forests; and the clay for the mould was seasoned for months beforehand; and then the furnace was kindled, and the logs took fire, and the heat became overpowering, and the craftsman sent for all his pewter platters and porringers and dishes, to the number of some two hundred pieces, and had them cast into the blaze, till the metal was in perfect liquefaction; and the mould filled beautifully; and, after it had cooled for two days, the statue was uncovered; and it was so complete, so fascinating, so picturesque, so

dramatic, that in his astonishment its artificer saw the hand of God arranging and controlling all. It is a parable of why the Holy Spirit sends us to the Wilderness and subjects us to the furnace. We come forth shaped into warriors of the Lord, warriors who are not bronze statues but living and loving men.

‘And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit to Galilee,’ says St. Luke. The sentence has in it something of the strength and pomp of an army marching back from battle with triumphant banners. He went into the wilderness driven by the Spirit. And now in the power of the Spirit He returns.¹

¹ J. H. Jowett, in *The Expositor and Current Anecdotes*, xxii. 68.

The Development of Thought within the Fourth Gospel.

BY THE REVEREND R. H. STRACHAN, D.D., EDINBURGH.

I.

THE question of the natural and chronological development of the teaching and events within the Synoptic Gospels may be regarded as more or less generally determined in its main outline. Something will be said later regarding the reasonableness of the demand for a complete harmony among the three. There is undoubtedly in the Fourth Gospel a sequence both of thought and of events which at many points directly contradicts the Synoptic sequences and, in my opinion, cannot be reconciled with these.

Before, however, we go on to discuss the nature of the development in the Fourth Gospel, it is necessary to say something about the thought itself, the general attitude of the writer towards Jesus and the events of His life.

One cannot escape the questions that arise in our minds when we compare this Gospel with the Synoptic narratives. Let me mention one or two of the familiar facts.

(1) We have a strikingly different conception of Jesus’ *miracles* in this Gospel. The Fourth Evangelist uses a different name for them. The Synoptic writers call them *δυνάμεις*—‘acts of

power,’ whose motive is compassion. Jesus Himself discourages the idea of laying undue stress on them, and they are wrung from Him, because He cannot bear to withhold the help that is sought. He will never work miracles as mere displays. He exercises His power because He loves men, and in a sense cannot help so doing. They are, in other words, spontaneous. In the Fourth Gospel the miracles are *evidential*. They are called, not *δυνάμεις* but *σημεῖα*—‘signs,’ ‘evidences,’ ‘demonstrations’ of His Person, His Divine Nature. Sometimes they are called *works* and it is interesting to note that the Fourth Evangelist seems to include under ‘works’ and ‘signs’ more than those acts we call miraculous. The miracles take their place among the other incidents of Jesus’ life as evidences of His Divine Nature and of His Divine Sonship.¹

¹ The contrast between the two conceptions of miracle has nowhere been more impressively stated than by R. H. Hutton. ‘The miraculous power which in St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke is mainly the organ of a Divine compassion for human misery and pain, is in this Gospel—primarily at least—the revealing medium of a mighty spiritual presence

(2) There are also the *Discourses*. They are not longer than some of the utterances in the Synoptics, but the style is different. We must, as has often been pointed out, guard against the idea that in the Synoptics—whether in narrative or in saying—we have the actual event, more or less photographically reproduced, or the actual word that once ‘ruffled the air of Palestine’; and that, by contrast, in the Fourth Gospel, we have an interpretation of events, and of sayings. There is no doubt to-day, in the mind of any responsible critic, that the Synoptic discourses and sayings also contain an element of added interpretation. In the Fourth Gospel, however, the feature is much more marked. It is akin, as Dr. Moffatt and others have pointed out, to what happens in the case of the noblest preaching, the result that follows ‘when the mind broods upon some fact or saying.’ It is also akin to the poet’s work, which is not pure invention, but creation. The problem has also an affinity with that created by the prophetic discourses and narratives in the Old Testament. ‘Thus saith the Lord’ is the prophetic formula, and in the O.T. historical events are so presented as to manifest the Divine action and purpose, and become the material of prophetic history.

In the Gospels, especially in the Fourth, and indeed in the N.T. generally, the formula is, ‘Thus saith Jesus’; ‘Thus did Jesus’; ‘Thus saith the Spirit.’ It is all a very significant indication of the place given to Jesus in the earliest Christian consciousness. What we appear to lose in historical accuracy we regain and more in our impression of the reality of the earliest belief as to the person of Jesus. ‘We have,’ as Paul says, ‘the mind of Christ.’

To return to the Discourses in the Fourth Gospel. Sometimes they are monologues, and often controversial dialogues; often, also, descriptions of fierce disputes with opponents. So fierce is the dispute, and so subtle are the points scored against opponents—occasionally by a purely rabbinical use of Scripture—that it is difficult to conceive that the historical Jesus is speaking. It is true that the Johannine discourses contain many

and intended more as a solemn parting in the clouds of Providence, to enable man to gaze up into the light of Divine mystery, than as a grateful temporary shower of blessing to a parched and blighted earth.’—*Theological Essays*, 178.

sayings either found in the Synoptics or like those found in the Synoptics, but in them generally there is a reliance on pure dialectic, which is unlike the direct, prophetic character of most of the Synoptic utterances. The so-called mystical element in the Johannine discourses need not present such difficulty in face of such passages as Mt 11^{25ff.}, as is generally supposed.

(3) There is an absence of that touch with contemporary reality in the time of Jesus, so prominent in the Synoptic Gospels. Where are the *parables*, with their vivid pictures—a woman’s single-room house, or a king’s feast, or a shepherd and his sheep? The Johannine parables are allegories (*παροιμίας*). Where are the publicans and sinners? Where are the crowds of sick and suffering laid at His feet? We have the shepherd in the Fourth Gospel, but we miss the toilsome journey of search in the wilderness, the sheep upon the shoulder of the shepherd, and the rejoicing friends and neighbours.

In general we may say that in the Fourth Evangelist’s attitude towards the healing activities of Jesus, in his account of His talk, in his pictures of contemporary life, we have displayed a purpose of mind which cannot fairly be described as an attempt to write history in our sense of the word. There is history and often most accurate history in this Gospel, but we feel that the actual history, the actual traditions he uses, are subordinated consciously and deliberately to a purpose of making them reflect the mind of the Church on Jesus’ Person. The historical setting in this Gospel really only plays the part of fulcrum to the lever. Thereon the Evangelist finds a place to stand that he may move the world—the Hellenistic world—to a sense of the universal significance of Jesus. He is using a mass of traditional material, partly akin to the Synoptic, partly ‘Johannine’ in character. He has subjected it to a pressure, which is also being exercised in his own soul by a growing and deepening Christian experience. The pressure sometimes originates new facts, and sometimes moulds the old facts into other shapes.¹

We miss, however, in the Fourth Gospel that gradual development of events and teaching which is so prominent in the Gospel of Mark. I assume that Mark may be regarded as the chief source from which can be inferred the general order of events in Christ’s life; the general development

¹ Cf. Moffatt, *Literature of the N.T.*, p. 540.

of His teaching; the gradual unfolding of His person, culminating in the great confession at Cæsarea Philippi; the moment of complete unveiling when the Cross is clearly held forth as the divinely necessary end of His career. On the other hand, there is practically no moment in the Fourth Gospel, no utterance of Jesus, in which the idea of the Cross has not a place.

(4) It is obvious that the proportion of space and attention given to the Jerusalem ministry of Jesus affords a complete contrast to the proportion given to the Galilean ministry in the Synoptic Gospels. There is no doubt that the Synoptic tradition needs to be amplified, and that there must have been a longer, and perhaps more frequent ministry in Jerusalem than the Synoptic narrative allows. For example, Judas was a Judean, and the intimacy with Martha and Mary points to frequent visits to Bethany. There is also the anonymous friend of the Upper Room. We have, above all, the lyric lament, 'How often would I have gathered thee!' spoken over a city He knew and loved, which points not to unfulfilled desire, but to baffled effort. The Temptations themselves, as has been significantly pointed out, presuppose a much larger mission of preaching and healing than Galilee is able alone to provide. The vision of 'the kingdoms of the world,' a crowd clamouring for bread, the pinnacle of the Temple, suggests the capital city with all its surging movements, political and religious.

At the same time, granting that the indications of a fuller Jerusalem ministry indirectly supplement the Synoptic narrative, it is, in face of all the facts, impossible to assert that this idea of supplementing the Synoptic writers enters into the direct purpose of the author of the Fourth Gospel. His is another and a different purpose altogether. His aim is not to write a mere narrative, for he is not ultimately responsible for the narrative; rather he makes use of narrative for an ideal purpose. If we take the Fourth Gospel as narrative, in the same sense as the Synoptic Gospels are narrative, we are speedily involved in futile and arbitrary attempts to harmonize its order and detail with those of the Synoptics. Even in the case of the Synoptics, it is a hopeless task to fit all the incidents and sayings in Matthew and Luke into the historical framework of Mark. 'Harmonies of the Gospels' are just *tours de force*, intended to buttress faith, and to rest it on a basis where it can never rest

alone. 'If I wished,' says Mr. R. H. Hutton, 'to doubt the possibility of a revelation, I should take a course of reading in defence of it.' This applies in particular to harmonistic treatments of the Gospel narratives, such as we find in many Lives of Jesus. There is and must ever be, for faith, a secure basis of history; but that basis must never be represented as a minimum or a maximum with which historical criticism has provided us. Faith must not be at the mercy of the latest N.T. critic, orthodox or advanced.¹

Jesus first becomes a historical fact for the Christian consciousness, as distinct from an antiquarian fact, neither in Galilee nor in Judea; but in the Upper Room after the Resurrection, at Pentecost, in Philippi, in Thessalonica. Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians is the earliest known N.T. document, and assumes a historical work of the risen Jesus through the Spirit. *The Lord is the Spirit*, as Paul says with fine historical sense and accuracy. The Spirit is the first manifestation in world-history of the real dynamic of the Christian Faith. Bernard Shaw, in his latest Preface, says that science has never been foolish enough to base the truth of the doctrine of specific gravity on the historical truth of the story that Archimedes, when he first discovered it, fled excited and naked out of his bath into the streets, and cried, *εὕρηκα*. The Church has not always been so wise. Even for the Gospel writers, the fact that comes last in their order of events, is in their experience the first, the fact of the risen and triumphant Christ.

The Evangelist uses history—as he found it—as a kind of transparent medium which conveys certain aspects of faith and unbelief. This method of writing pictorial history, in the form of 'historical sermons,' was a familiar Jewish method. Large stretches of the O.T. historical books can be interpreted only in this way, e.g. the stories of Elijah and Elisha. The method was known as *haggadah*, a homily founded on portions of the sacred history. In one important aspect the Fourth Gospel may be regarded as Christian *haggadah*. It was a process of extracting the spiritual as distinct from

¹ Religion can never be secure on the basis of mere external historical credentials. If it professes to be so, it becomes mere antiquarian research. We may begin with historical evidence, but we must 'hold our trust in God by the same tenure as our trust in man: that of living and growing *personal* impression.'—Hutton, *Theological Essays*, p. 167.

the 'bodily' meaning of a narrative, a process which every homilist to-day adopts. *Haggadah*, however, is not a complete explanation of the thought of this Gospel. 'Poetry,' in Matthew Arnold's words, 'attaches its emotion to the idea: the idea is the fact. The strongest part of our religion to-day is its unconscious poetry.' There is much more than *haggadah* in the Fourth Gospel. There is that universal kind of religious imagination which is the expression of Christian experience; its relation to the facts that lie behind the Gospels; that unchanging dramatic interpretation of scenes and persons whereby the speaker or worshipper is enabled to speak or to think as though he himself were one of the actors in the scene.

Love always has a swift and powerful dramatic tendency; and some men whose religious love has been at once profound and transfiguring, have seen the atonement as a constant moving tragedy of sacrifice in which they themselves, with the egoism of supreme humility, have taken a privileged, if superfluous part. Around the central figure they see changed all the world, in a vast cirque of multitudinous human experience, and themselves present foremost in the crowd acclaiming or reviling. Except with themselves dramatically present, except in the light of this religious egoism, they do not and could not realize His life and death.¹

A similar imaginative process has been at work in the Fourth Gospel. The process has been at work all through, but no one can read the writer's dramatic presentations, especially of the betrayal, trial, and crucifixion of Jesus, without feeling that they are written by one who has taken part in these scenes more closely and more really than even an actual eye-witness who stood too near the events could do. He has entered more fully into the psychology of Peter's denial than any of the other three evangelists. He shrinks in horror from Judas' deed, vividly depicts the irony of the condemnation by Caiaphas, and realizes the pitiable-ness of Pilate's moral vacillation to a degree shared by none of the other evangelists. He has, indeed, been there, and has said, 'Lord, is it I?'

This Gospel represents the classical attempt to present a portrait of Jesus—the real historical Jesus—in His activity both pre-Resurrection and post-Resurrection, which shall be adequate as an object of faith to a world that is far wider in its horizon, far older in its intellectual outlook and

environment, than the Jewish world. It is the Hellenistic world, which includes not only Judaism, but Grecian and Roman thought, and into which there has been poured a mingled stream of Oriental religious thought, mystery-cults, and others. Is Christianity a Jewish sect, or is it a world-religion? Is Jesus the 'Word,' the 'Logos,' the answer to the questionings which the great world-process, the 'Nature' of the Stoic, the 'Evolution' of to-day, makes to arise in men's minds? We might almost say that the Fourth Evangelist is the great 'modernist' of his day, and a type for all modernists; for he is also a missionary, not of intellectual ideas merely, but of the good news of a Christ great enough for the ever-expanding needs—moral, intellectual, and spiritual—of humanity.

It needs also to be reiterated that the Fourth Evangelist's work is the crown and completion of the missionary and theological activity of Paul. The intellectual background of Paul's preaching is a presentation of the risen Jesus, whose work is represented as a great spiritual Drama enacted in the Universe. Jesus has vanquished the hostile spiritual powers, 'principalities and powers.' They are the 'forces,' as we would call them, in life, that make men afraid, or lead them astray. Sin, Pain, and Death are personified. These 'powers' are sometimes incarnate in hostile human personalities; sometimes they act like thunder-bolts from a clear sky, hindering and thwarting the human heart, and robbing us of what is dear—'hunger, famine, pestilence, sword.' Men are 'dying daily,' expending faith and strength, sacrifice and moral effort—is it in vain? In the Cross of Christ, Paul saw, as in spiritual vision, God and 'Satanism' in mortal combat. 'Satanism' slew 'the Lord of glory' and God 'highly exalted him, and gave him a name above every name.' 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself.' Paul's 'good news' was that men, who were in such bondage of fear, might now walk with a new spirit of hope, confidence, and moral victory in their hearts. Their hearts were eternally at rest; for they could say 'Abba, Father.' The lover's sweet dynamic of carelessness, and freedom, and cleansing was in their hearts—'The Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.' And the crowning wonder was that in that vast terrifying universe God had taken the first step.

Paul was dead, and the communities he had founded remained. The immediate touch with

¹ John Freeman, *Essay on Maeterlinck*, 'The Moderns,' p. 162.

the historical Jesus was being lost. It was the beginning of the second century. Persecution and the years were thinning the ranks of the earliest disciples. Even believers were beginning to ask, 'Where is the promise of His coming?'

'What shall we say in answer to those who in the name of Judaism assert that Paul and his Master too, were mere iconoclasts, mere Sabbath-breakers, mere freaks of history? What shall we say in answer to those who see in our Eucharist another pagan custom or secret rite, or to those sacramentarians among us who give such an impression? ¹ What shall we say to those who see in our Lord a

¹ 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' (6⁵²).

criminal condemned not only by a Jewish court, but by a Roman tribunal? What shall we say to the Stoic who sees in Gethsemane only a moral breakdown, and a pitiful exhibition of weakness? What shall we say to sneers, like the later sneer of Celsus, that 'no good general was ever betrayed'? ²

Space forbids the further development of this line of thought. It is sufficient to say that the environment of the Fourth Gospel in the beginning of the second century A.D. will require much more attention, if we are ever to understand why just such ideas and such incidents as it contains were chosen.

² Moffatt, *Literature of the N.T.*, p. 530, note.

Contributions and Comments.

Gideon and his Three Hundred (Judg. vii. 5, 6).

IN the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES Professor Gautier of Geneva takes exception to the statement made in the April number that these verses are quite in order and that no emendations are required; and he refers to a discussion of this story in Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament*—a reference for which many will thank him. The best defence of the above statement will be a literal translation of the verses, taking the verb *kara'* in what is no doubt its primitive sense of 'to drink like a horse by putting the mouth in the water.' The verses run: 'So he led the people down to the water, and the Lord said to Gideon, Every man who laps of the water with his tongue, as a dog laps, you will set by himself, and every man who goes down on his knees and puts his mouth in the water in drinking. Now the number of those who lapped, putting their hands to their mouths, was three hundred, and all the rest of the people went down on their knees and put their mouths in the water in drinking water.' The last phrase is a little inelegant in English owing to the repetition of the word 'water.'

Now this is exactly the sense given by Frazer in the passage referred to by Dr. Gautier, only that he renders the verb *kara'* by the English verb 'to suck,' which is, of course, what a horse does.

In Hebrew this primitive sense of the verb *kara'* seems to be obsolete, but it still retains the meaning of going down on the knees and putting the mouth in the dust, as Sindbad the Sailor was in the habit of doing, and as Mordecai was expected to do (Est 3^{2.5}). As the word is found under forty times in the Hebrew Bible, perhaps the wonder is to find it even once in its primitive sense.

Professor Gautier also objects to the statement that the Hebrew word for 'water' implies rain-water, but the reference was to the word *kara'*. Perhaps it would have been better to say 'suggests' rather than 'implies.'

May I venture one step further? It would be difficult to exaggerate our ignorance of classical Hebrew. Of its rhetoric, metaphors, allusions, and figures of speech we know nothing. To this ignorance is no doubt due the very large number of verses in the Hebrew Bible of which we can make nothing. The present seems to be a pretty clear case where a result of criticism is really due to our ignorance of the language. Much else is no doubt due to the same cause. Even in Arabic, with all the aid of native grammarians, the most famous European scholars make slips. The best horse stumbles sometimes. But in regard to Hebrew, for the European to attempt criticism is to hunt the fox without a scent.

T. H. WEIR.

Glasgow University.

The Unnamed Companion of Cleopas.

THE Gospels present us with many important questions of personal identity, their importance being mainly due to the practical issues which await upon critical investigation and decision. Among the most interesting and perplexing of this class of question is that concerning the unnamed companion of Cleopas in the Emmaüs story of Lk 24¹³⁻³⁵. It has puzzled exegetes and scholars for many generations. Why is only one named of the two? What significance attaches to the one name mentioned which could account for its assertion in the narrative? Would the name of Cleopas have any importance that could suggest a reason for referring to him specially? If Cleopas is mentioned nowhere else in the Gospels, can the mention of his name here be of any value? These are some of the obvious questions which set us on more eagerly in search for the identity of his unnamed companion. We may possibly discover that the name of Cleopas furnishes a clue as to that other one,' and that the unnamed disciple may be identified by piecing together the internal data. By the simple process of exhausting the theories which have been advanced, we may arrive at a satisfactory starting-point for our inquiry.

1. That this unnamed disciple was not St. Luke himself, is clear from the fact that he implicitly affirms (Lk 1²) that his Gospel had been delivered to him by eye-witnesses of the resurrection, and that he had not himself seen the risen Lord. (*Vide* Archbishop Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, chapter 'The Walk to Emmaüs.')

2. Jerome declared that they both may have been of the Seventy, but Trench cautiously remarks, 'We cannot affirm it with any certainty.'

3. Dr. David Smith refers to other conjectures in *The Days of His Flesh*, footnote on p. 511), such as Origen's theory that it was Simon, and Epiphanius' notion that it was Nathanael.

But these, and many others that are similar, lack trustworthy proofs, and our only hope of a reasonable solution is in pressing our inquiry back patiently and critically to a re-examination of the internal evidences. And here we find ourselves faced with a linguistic problem. The only similarity to the name Cleopas in Lk 24¹⁸ is that

of Clopas in Jn 19²⁵, and although N.T. scholars have repeatedly warned us against identifying the two names as representing one and the same man, it must not be assumed that the matter is closed, or that the warning suggests solid and unmovable difficulties. A sound and wise critical attitude towards the Bible documents forbids unalterable conclusions upon questions relating to text. And this is entirely a question of text—that is to say, of language.

Two very pertinent articles in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*—one on 'Alphæus' (vol. i. pp. 74, 75) and one on 'The Brethren of the Lord' (vol. i. p. 320)—throw considerable light upon the identity of Cleopas. It is quite evident that some N.T. scholars of repute have decided that Cleopas of Lk 24¹⁸ and Clopas of Jn 19²⁵ are identical. Ewald assumes this. So also do Meyer, Alford, and Lightfoot. Controversy has waged around the identification of Cleopas and Clopas with Alphæus, the two Greek names being regarded as a simple transliteration of the Aramaic Halphai. Is then the difference between Luke's use of the word Κλεόπας and John's use of the word Κλωπᾶς to be accounted for by the different linguistic origins of the two Gospels?

Dr. A. B. Bruce in his *Introduction to St. Luke's Gospel* (*Expositor's Greek Test.*) says that 'the literary aspect of this Gospel is a complex phenomenon. At times . . . one gets the impression of a writer having at his command a knowledge of Greek possible only for one to whom it was his native tongue, an expert at once in the vocabulary and the grammatical structure of that language. But far oftener the impression is that of a Jew thinking in Hebrew and reflecting the Hebrew idiom in phrase and construction.' If that finding is accurate there is no difficulty in accepting the Hebrew-Greek origin of Luke's Κλεόπας.

In regard to the Fourth Gospel there has recently been published a fresh contribution to the baffling problem of its linguistic origin. Dr. C. F. Burney, the eminent Oxford Semitist, has just issued a notable volume on *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. By a critical examination of the differentiating constructions which are characteristically Hebraic and those which are definitely Aramaic he shows that whereas Luke's style is Greek often modelled upon the Hebraic Greek of the LXX, John's, on the other hand, is so entirely

Aramaic, that we must presuppose an original Aramaic Gospel which has been translated with unidiomatic fidelity into Greek. This ingenious theory, differing as it does from the verdict of Deissmann and Wellhausen, and from Dr. Rendel Harris's characteristically original and illuminating contribution on the Greek origin of the Logos doctrine of the prologue of the Fourth Gospel (vide *The Expositor*, Sept. 1920), is not only revolutionary in current Johannine criticism, but calls for a re-examination of the linguistic data of all the Gospels.

In the light of this discussion we may assume that the Hebraic-Greek form of Κλεόπας in Luke is only a variant of the Aramaic-Greek Κλωπᾶς of John, and that in fact the two words actually represent one and the same man. Now this is exceedingly important as furnishing a clue to the unnamed companion of Cleopas.

The reference to Cleopas in Jn 19²⁵ is as the husband of Mary, one of the four women who, John tells us, 'stood by the cross of Jesus.' Luke prefaces the Emmæus story by a reference to the women who were with those who visited the sepulchre, 'and returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles' (Lk 24⁹⁻¹⁰). Among 'the other women' we may justly include the 'Mary of Cleopas.' So it is clear that she stood by the cross, and had seen the empty sepulchre. She was as deeply convinced of the resurrection as of the crucifixion. And the empty sepulchre had proved to the women that Jesus was alive. With the swift intuition of womanhood where love is concerned, they were persuaded of the resurrection, and hurried to tell 'all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest' (Lk 24⁹). 'All the rest' included the Seventy, and all other of Christ's disciples, and among them was Cleopas. 'And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.'

Cleopas did not believe. The crucifixion shattered his hopes, as it had shattered the hopes of others. So he turns back home again, a disappointed and dejected man. And it is a quite natural inference that Mary, his wife, accompanied him. With her radiant conviction that the Lord was risen she would seek to lift the cloud of his despond-

ency and doubt. They took the road home together, and the fading light of sunset and the shadows along the dusty country road were a fit setting for the interplay of hope and doubt that mingled in their conversation as 'they talked together of all these things which had happened.' 'From more than one word in the conversation, we may take it for granted that these two were in earnest debate; not unduly striving nor contending, but still regarding from different points of view, and each urging upon the other a different interpretation of that stupendous event.'

It is evident from Luke's narrative that they were of diverse temperaments, 'Cleopas being inclined to despond, whereas his companion was of a sanguine turn, and a somewhat heated controversy arose between them. In the midst of it a stranger joined them. He accosted them, saying, 'What are these arguments which ye are bandying one with another as ye walk?' Ashamed that their quarrel had been overheard, they stood with downcast faces (v. 17, καὶ ἐστάθησαν σκυθρωποί). The gloomy Cleopas answered, not without petulance, perhaps resenting the intrusion, 'Art thou sojourning all alone in Jerusalem, that thou knowest not the things that have been done therein during these days?' 'And,' sighed Cleopas, 'we were hoping that it was He that should redeem Israel, but to crown all, this is the third day since these things were done!' 'Yes,' broke in the other, more hopefully, 'and some women of our company . . . said they had also seen a vision of angels which said that He was alive!' 'But,' retorted the unbelieving Cleopas, 'they did not see Him!' (David Smith, *The Days of His Flesh*, p. 511 *et seq.*)

Then came the Master's lesson from the Scriptures, their arrival at the Emmæus home, the acceptance of hospitality, the startling disclosure to the now eager man and wife, and the sacramental uplift of the evening meal. If it be a fact that, after all, the unnamed companion of Cleopas was his own wife, we can understand why in deference to Oriental custom, the man's name only is mentioned, and we can put the graphic story alongside of other incidents in the Scriptures which show us how believing women have helped their doubting husbands into 'the full assurance of faith.'

C. EVELYN CHARLESWORTH.

Bristol.

'I buffet my Body.'

Is not Mr. Fotheringham straining the text somewhat in his explanation—in the December issue of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES—of the above passage? The word *ἑκπαίδω* certainly means, 'I beat black and blue,' but in its literal sense it suggests the black eye given in boxing (*ἑκός + ὤψ*), an interpretation which hardly fits in with what he calls 'the wholesome discipline of the scourge.'

The word occurs again in Lk 18⁵. Perhaps here also we ought to understand that the judge fears that the widow will one day belabour him with the 'wholesome discipline of the scourge'! The explanation of Protestant commentators surely gives better sense.

H. R. MOXLEY.

*The Parsonage,
St. Mary Cray.*

'A Great High Priest' (Hebrews iv. 14).

THE Apostle uses here a very unusual combination of predicates to describe the office of our Lord. It is found nowhere else. Even the term *ἀρχιεὺς* is never used by the Septuagint. In the earlier books of the Bible it always translates the Hebrew *הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל* by *ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας*. In the later books, where the Hebrew is *כֹּהֵן הָרָאשׁ*, it translates either *ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας* or *ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ πρῶτος*. Why then this unusual combination? It is not enough to say that the Apostle wished by the predicate *μέγας* to point out the greatness of Christ in comparison with the other high priests. He does this right throughout the Epistle. But it is only in connexion with the Ascension of our Lord that he uses this uncommon combination, and therefore presumably with a definite purpose.

With the late Dr. Biesenthal (whose views in his almost unknown Commentary I adopt and also somewhat enlarge), I believe that the Apostle used this combination deliberately and with a definite purpose, (1) because of the peculiar circumstances of the time, and (2) to accentuate the unchangeable and eternal High Priesthood of our Lord.

Seemingly the predicate *גָּדוֹל* = *μέγας* was originally applied only to the virtually acting high priest. Later the term *רָאשׁ* took the place of *גָּדוֹל*.

But towards the end of the Second Temple, when political power influenced the choice of high priests and the office was often sold to the highest bidder and almost changed annually, and the number of deposed or ex-high priests became large (no fewer than 26 are enumerated from the days of Herod to the destruction of the Temple), the title *גָּדוֹל* was left for the use of the deposed high priests, who also occasionally and as a matter of courtesy exercised certain functions; while for the acting high priest the title of *כֹּהֵן הָרָאשׁ* was used. Hence while there were times when there was a large number of *ἀρχιερεῖς*, which confirms the accuracy of the New Testament writers in often speaking of 'high priests,' there was always only one official 'Cohen-ha-Rosh' = *כֹּהֵן הָרָאשׁ*.

This being the case, one can at once see the reason why the Apostle uses the two predicates. He declares thereby, first, that, as Christ is 'Priest for ever' (Ps 110⁴), the title of *כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל* belongs to Him *eo ipso* and He can never be deprived of it. Secondly, as He is the ever-acting High Priest in Heaven, and yet the ever-present with the company of the Faithful, He is also the *כֹּהֵן הָרָאשׁ*. No mortal can combine with His name these two titles; they belong exclusively to 'Jesus the Son of God.' By this unusual combination, which has seemingly escaped the notice of commentators, but must have been very suggestive to the Hebrew-Christians to whom the Epistle was addressed, the Apostle not only points out the greatness, but the eternal Priesthood of our risen and ascended Lord.

This view proves at the same time the historical accuracy of St. Luke 3², where commentators puzzled about 'Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests,' and also refutes the assertion in the *Jewish Encyclopædia*, that 'John made a curious error (11⁴⁹ 18¹³) in speaking of Caiaphas as high priest "in that year," as if he interchanged every year with Annas.' St. John made no error; he stated a fact which he was specially cognizant of, as 'he was known unto the high priest,' and perhaps was even related to the family. Caiaphas was the acting high priest 'that same year,' that fateful year to the troubled fortunes of Israel. Annas had held the office a little while before under Quirinius, just as his three sons became high priests a little while afterwards, and undoubtedly, though deposed, was a man of great influence. It would perhaps be as well if modern critics were not quite so ready to

charge the Evangelists with ignorance or historical inaccuracy of events they must have been familiar with.

It is noteworthy that the late Professor Delitzsch, in his Hebrew Version, translated the ἀρχιερεύς of Jn 11⁴⁴ by כֹּהֵן הָרֹאשׁ and He 4¹⁴ by כֹּהֵן רֹאשׁ גָּדוֹל, thus only differing from

Dr. Biesenthal in not using the article with the word רֹאשׁ. One wonders why in 1813 he uses the Rabbinic and redundant אִשֵּׁר שֶׁמֶשׁ בְּכֹהֵנָה גָּדוֹלָה, 'who served in the high priesthood,' for exactly the same Greek word.

C. P. SHERMAN.

Hexham.

Entre Nous.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF PEACE.

To Dr. Hastings' series on 'The Great Christian Doctrines' has now been added a volume on *The Christian Doctrine of Peace* (T. & T. Clark; 8s. net). It has all the special features of the earlier volumes, which dealt with the doctrines of Prayer and Faith.

The subject of this latest volume is very prominent in men's minds at the present time, for to-day we are turning afresh to the ideal of universal peace. As Principal A. E. Garvie said recently, 'The Christian ideal of world-peace has to-day an authority and influence which it never had before.' Long before the Genoa and Copenhagen Conferences were held, Dr. Hastings had, as he stated in the November issue of *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, prepared this volume, the final proofs of which were passed shortly before his death. In the Introduction he outlined the scope of this work which he hoped would be used as the basis of discourse when peace was preached, as he saw it must be 'before everything else.' 'Peace is peace with God, peace with self, peace with other men. And peace with men includes peace with nations. Thus the doctrine of peace is the doctrine of war, and we have to consider from the Christian point of view the use of force, Christ's teaching on non-resistance, and the whole subject of the necessity of war, its advantages and disadvantages, and the prospect of its passing away for ever.'

The contents of the volume include the introduction and sixteen chapters. The subject-headings of some of these chapters are: 'The God of Peace,' 'The Peace of Christ,' 'Peace with God,' and 'Peace of Conscience.' The chapter on 'The Sermon on the Mount' is specially important. The subject is dealt with under three heads, 'Its

Hearers,' 'Its Method,' and 'Its Aim.' This is followed by chapters on 'The Use of Force,' 'War,' 'The Good of War,' 'The Evil of War,' 'The End of War,' concluding with 'What are We to Do?' Every chapter is prefaced by a very full list of literature.

Dr. Hastings' conclusion as to the prospect of war passing away for ever may be summed up in the verses of John Addington Symonds which he quotes.

These things shall be: a loftier race
Than ere the world hath known shall rise,
With flame of freedom in their souls
And light of knowledge in their eyes.

They shall be gentle, brave, and strong
To spill no drop of blood, but dare
All that may plant man's lordship firm
On earth, and fire, and sea, and air.

Nation with nation, land with land,
Unarmed shall live as comrades free;
In every heart and brain shall throb
The pulse of one fraternity.

SOME TOPICS.

Our Ambiguous Life.

'In a most pathetic passage in Plato we are told that in face of the great darkness and mysteriousness which are round about us in this world, there is nothing for a man to do except to take the best advice he can get as to how to live, and then take his chance—like a man crossing the lonely sea upon a raft; "unless," he concludes, "we can find some vessel more safe and solid, some word of God on which we may make this passage more securely."

It was into such a twilight and ambiguity that the Lord Jesus Christ came. And still there is no victory over this world, no light upon its final mysteriousness, no support for our apparent insignificance face to face with an overwhelming and regardless universe; no rock on which to plant our feet 'mid the ebb and flow of mood and feeling, of doubt and hope and doubt again, except by a humble and tenacious faith which we allow day by day to recall us and to sustain us, that the Eternal God is our Refuge and underneath are the Everlasting Arms.' This is from the first address in Dr. J. A. Hutton's latest volume, *Our Ambiguous Life* (James Clarke; 6s. net). It explains Dr. Hutton's title and gives the underlying thought of the short addresses. These are sure to be widely read, for Dr. Hutton is a preacher who makes a powerful appeal to the modern mind.

Politics in the Pulpit.

Miss Royden is too closely in touch with the mind of her congregation not to know that some annoyance might be felt, even if it were not expressed, at a political sermon. And so she told the members why she intended occasionally to treat political issues in the pulpit—the politics of the day, that is. For they would welcome a sermon, she knew, from the words of an Old Testament prophet, forgetting that to the people who heard them they seemed in their time tactlessly political. Nor is Miss Royden content to treat distant issues that are not likely to irritate. 'The other day,' she said, 'I was at a missionary meeting where the missionary told us about his work in India. He said, "These people, if you will believe it, many of them do not own a yard of land in the great country which belongs to them. They do not even own the house they live in. Many of them are in debt. They cannot get money. They cannot get on. They never seem to have a chance. So we set to work to try and alter these conditions." All the audience burst into a thunder of applause, and I held my head and thought to myself: "Is he describing India, or is he describing England?" There was extraordinarily little difference between his description of India and England, but because India is so far away, every one saw how right it was that the Church of Christ should be concerned with men's bodies as well as their souls and should care when people suffer, not only to bind up their

wounds, but to get rid of the cause of the trouble.'

Miss Royden's reason for occasionally preaching political sermons is that she believes that there is no question to which Christ's laws do not apply, and that there are times not only for the declaration of principles, but for their application to particular issues. 'How proud,' she says, 'those of us who belong to any Christian Church would be, if we could have claimed that it had always spoken for those who could not speak for themselves! If a Wilberforce, or a Lord Shaftesbury had not been left to fight his battle almost alone; if a Mrs. Josephine Butler had not been cast out by nearly all the people who called themselves respectable.'

Miss Royden knows that in every political question where a moral issue is involved good Christian people are found on both sides. They were found on both sides of the slavery struggle, but one side was wrong. She recognizes that she has a duty to inform her mind to the utmost of her ability, and then, not hindered by the fear of hurting people's feelings, to preach with directness the truth as she sees it.

What of the starving children of Austria? Should a preacher confine himself to appeals for money for them—a political question no doubt, but not involving disturbing criticism of foreign policy. 'What would you think?' asks Miss Royden, 'if year after year you pour your money into Vienna, and year after year I come to you with the same story, and say: "These children are still starving." And you will say at last: "Why, we have given all this money! Why are they still in the same state?" And I say, "Because the terms of the peace that was imposed on Austria have made it impossible for Austria to recover."

'Would not you have a right to say to me at last: "Why did you not say at the beginning all this?"'

Miss Royden has preached on our Irish policy, on Disarmament, on the Care of the Insane, and many other political topics—political in the broad sense of the word. These sermons have now been collected and published by Messrs. Putnams under the title *Political Christianity* (3s. 6d. net).

Divorce.

In Mt 5³² Jesus faces the burning question of divorce, and here His word is unmistakably clear. It is possible that even the clause which has been

interpreted as conveying an exception should read 'notwithstanding the word' (in Dt 24¹) 'about misconduct before marriage.' But it should be observed that He is here speaking of marriage between disciples; a large proportion of the marriages now 'solemnized'—to use what is perhaps an unhappy expression—in Christian Churches are not Christian in any recognizable sense of the word; it is exceedingly questionable whether we have any right to say in such cases, 'Whom God hath joined, let not man put asunder,' and we should not seek to impose a law meant to apply to Christian marriage in a contract in which the only power which can make the marriage permanent has never, so far as we can tell, had a place. The honest thing for the Church to do is, I believe, to refuse to be a party to marriages except between her members, or those at least who are prepared to make an open profession of faith, and then to insist that the contract so entered into is not dissoluble by the default of either party. By so doing we should lose much popularity, but we should gain in self-respect, and—what is more important—we should be in line with the teaching of Jesus in regard to this most difficult of all questions.¹

Meekness.

The word 'meek' is specially difficult to render in modern speech, for it has a wealth of meaning. In the Old Testament it seems to mean 'humble'; in the New it is applied to Himself by Jesus in close connexion with another phrase translated in our versions 'lowly in heart,' but perhaps more adequately rendered 'of homely mind,' 'easy to get on with.' In the Bible, when two epithets are joined by 'and,' it will be found very often that each explains the other. 'Unassuming' or 'ready to make allowances' gives us one side of the meaning of the word, 'patiently persistent' the other. It should be noticed that they are 'to inherit the earth'; that is, to fall heirs to the lordship of human life. They are men, who, with great ends in view, are willing to give way and make allowances in matters of smaller moment; they have that rare faculty, the ability to distinguish trifles from what is of serious importance. All quarrelsome people justify themselves on the ground that the thing is a question of principle with them; the meek man knows by instinct where he must fight and where he can safely yield ground. It may be

claimed that 'meekness' in this sense of the word has proved the secret of such success as we have had as an imperial power, as it certainly helped the Roman Empire to hold the nations of the world together for so many centuries. Where we have known how to give way, as in South Africa, we have built up our Empire; where we have been unyielding, as in the war with our American colonies in the eighteenth century, and in so much of our dealings with Ireland in this, we have failed disastrously.²

The Ministry and Women.

The Rev. J. A. Craigie, the Vicar of Montacute, Somerset, has published a volume of topical sermons with the title *Our Heavenly Inheritance* (Skeffingtons; 5s. net). The range of subjects is wide—from 'Jesus Christ and Modernism,' which is the first sermon in the volume, to 'The Weather,' which is the last. In all his sermons Mr. Craigie aims, as he tells us in the Preface, at great plainness of speech. This is, perhaps, best seen in his discussion on the 'Ministry and Women.' His position, which we are not concerned to criticise, is that the ministry is no place for women. The reasoning, however, by which he arrives at his conclusion is interesting. Or did he perhaps start with the conclusion and find the reasons afterwards?

The first difficulty about the admission of women to the priesthood is a practical one. No bishops could be found ready to ordain women. 'If they did so they would quickly be deprived of their sees, and the women whom they had ordained could not be recognised by the Catholic Church as holding any ministerial office. And, again, the matter is not one to be settled by a handful of bishops, however right they might seem in their own eyes. The matter is one which would have to be settled by the authority of the whole Catholic Church, or at any rate by a universal or œcumenical council of that branch of the Catholic Church in which the question might arise.'

Mr. Craigie's second difficulty is that the mere suggestion that women should be admitted to take upon themselves the duties and functions of the priesthood wakes within men 'an instinctive horror and revulsion.' He admits that many other things which are now looked upon as quite suitable for women to-day at first appeared shocking, but he add

¹ J. A. Findlay, *The Realism of Jesus*, 88.

² J. A. Findlay, *The Realism of Jesus*, 67f.

that 'the priesthood is not to be mentioned or classed with these in any way. It is beyond all comparison.'

His final argument for the exclusion of women, not only from the priesthood but also from the position of deaconess, is that the silence of Christ with regard to it points to the fact that the ordination of women is contrary to His will. This is how Mr. Craigie sums it up himself. 'I think we cannot but be right when all is said and done, if we adhere to the distinction of sex which has ever obtained in the Church of Christ in regard to its ministry. The old way here, the beaten track, the old paths, seem to have been laid down by Christ once for all, and they are not open to innovations. We must reverently hesitate to tamper with anything which is left seemingly complete and unalterable.' What would Mr. Craigie's attitude have been towards slavery? 'With the cleverest arguments in the world,' Mr. Craigie goes on, 'we are still without His direct sanction to make a change. Let it be the office to go on in the old way; and if we desire the ministrations of women in the Church (as indeed we do), let them be in that direction in which there can be no possible doubt or question. Then no harm can come or outrage be perpetrated.'

Two Things Religion does.

'In the first place, the religion I am thinking of brings all our perplexities to a focus; lifts them up on high; concentrates them on two or three turning points, and shows us with a clearness that admits of no mistaking what a tremendous mystery we are up against in life.

That is the first thing that a true religion does. But if it did that only, it would do us no good but harm, for it would overwhelm us. So it does the second. While, on the one hand, it reveals to us, as I have said, the deep and amazing mystery of our existence, on the other it reveals something yet deeper and more amazing in ourselves, something divine in every one of us, which is more than a match for what it has to face. A true religion does both things, does them together, in the same moment, in the same act.'¹

NEW POETRY.

John Drinkwater.

Mr. Drinkwater goes on from strength to strength. *Preludes, 1921-1922* (Sidgwick; 3s. 6d. net),

¹ W. L. P. Jacks, *Religious Perplexities*.

he has given us the finest work he has yet done.

The subject of the book is love:

What love is; how I love; how builders' clay
By love is lit into a golden spending;
How love calls beautiful ghosts back to the day;
How life because of love shall have no ending—
These with the dawn I have begun to sing . . .

And Mr. Drinkwater presents his subject in four of its many aspects.

First he retells the story of David and Jonathan, the love of perfect sympathy and understanding between man and man. Then he takes another familiar Bible narrative. 'The Maid of Naaman's Wife,' and shows the love that has its ground in pity. This is half the book and, for us, the most convincing part and the most valuable. Take this descriptive passage. Look at the colour of the picture of the stripling David facing the Philistine. Listen to the music of the lines:

And David stepped out of the emerald light
That played up from the grass floor of the tent,
Into the full flood of the April noon,
And walked a little way, and those two stood
Parted a hundred paces, the man of terror,
Hewn massy and with shock of builded limbs,
And David moulded like a sea boy risen
From caves of music where the water spins
Wet sand into the shapes of flowing flowers;
David with limbs all bright with the sun's tones,
And ruddy locks curling with youth and light,
His body all alert on steady loins,
Clean spun of flesh that knew the winter snows,
And mellow pools of summer, and the dews
Dropping among the crocuses of dawn.
His sandal-straps bound ankles as a girl's,
And fluttering to his knees the sheepskin hung,
Cloaking one shoulder, while the other gleamed.
And there he paused, the sling in his right hand,
His left hand fingering the pouch of pebbles,
While Israel fearing murmured, and the hosts
Of Philistine derision rocked the noon.
Then did Goliath cry, 'Am I a dog,
For a boy's whipping? Have you not a man,
That you would send a cleaner up of crumbs
From the queen's table? Come then, and be
broken,
For birds to find you and the dogs at night.'
And Jonathan heard Philistia shout again,

And David, like a flame unwinded, stood
 Quivering at the cry, and laid a stone
 In the sling's fold, and cast his staff, and ran,
 Fleet as the king bird gliding under leaves,
 Towards Goliath. And a giant spear
 Swung from the Philistine hand, and forty paces
 Sang in the air and brushed the flying sheepskin,
 And sudden David's feet were planted firm,
 Locked on the earth, and circling in the sun
 The tight thong flashed and loosened, and the stone
 Smote the Philistine wrath above the eyes,
 And the day was clouded from him, and he fell.

In the second half of the book Mr. Drinkwater turns from the Bible narratives to give us the story of two modern lovers. A Sussex farmer, Lake Winter, falls in love with his neighbour's wife, Zell Dane. The attraction is, at the outset, an intellectual one, but the physical element asserts itself, and their story ends in tragedy. Finally in the poem 'Burning Bush' we have nature, love, and human love blended and mutually interpretative. These blank verse poems form the bulk of the volume, but there are, in addition, several delightful lyrics.

Bernard Raymund.

The Yale University Press are issuing a series of small volumes of poetry with the name of 'The Yale Series.' The object of the series is to bring to the notice of the public the work of the younger American men and women who have not yet secured recognition. The most recent volume in the series is *Hidden Waters*, by Bernard Raymund (Milford: Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net). Mr. Raymund's poems are not equal, but there is a delicate charm about most of them. 'The Dark Pool' is a good example of his descriptive work:

I know a pool where laughter never was,
 No bird spread dripping feathers to the sun,
 And no flower stood on tiptoe in the grass
 To wonder at itself. The minnows run
 From stone to stone, unbodied, shadowless;
 And water-striders thread their secret way
 Under gnarled, ancient roots and tangled cress.
 I know a pool that on the windiest day
 From bank to bank will not a ruffle show,
 And never a willow leaf put out its sail
 To find if all the wonders could be so
 It gathered from the old tree's misty tale.
 But all tired waters pause in that cool deep
 To dream of other, farther pools and sleep.

The second poem of Mr. Raymund's which we quote is hardly characteristic, but it is good for our purpose. It is on prayer and growth, and he calls it 'Homiletic':

If it were so
 That things pray as they grow,
 It seems to me
 In the wild rye that overtops the wheat
 There were more piety.
 And yellow clover growing in a ditch
 God's nose must find
 More to its liking than the red-top's rich
 Smug acreage. I'm of that mind
 Myself, and sure I do not know
 That I should think it strange—if it were so!

Oxford Poetry.

Oxford Poetry, 1922 (Oxford: Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net), contains examples of the verse of twenty Oxford men. Some of the names we already know. But we have no poem from Mr. Blackwell himself this year, and we miss it. Mr. Force Stead's verse runs smoothly, and we quote his 'Oblivion'—a poem which he addresses to Alan Porter. Mr. Porter has one poem in the collection.

As if the dead had sought to reach
 Us through the names they used to know,
 They carved these rain-bleared stones to teach
 What men were they, laid here a-row:
 But now hath time twice marred their speech,
 The stones are dumb as they below.

Yet I surmise they rose at break
 Of dawn, and trudged afield, and then
 Laboured with ox and ass to take
 Bread for the hungry world of men,
 Sweating at plough and spade and rake
 Till dusk, for threescore years and ten.

Ever they rose at brink of day,
 Yet drank they once the joy of morn?—
 Life from them turned its mind away,
 They were not even thought forlorn:

Falstaff can never die,—but they,
 Nay, tell me,—were they ever born?

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
 and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
 Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.